A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF PRINCIPALS IN SCHOOLS WITH HIGH AND LOW PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

BY

JOYCE C. KIRKPATRICK

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1980

Copyright 1980
by
Joyce C. Kirkpatrick

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Arthur J. Lewis for his guidance as chairman of my supervisory committee and particularly for his suggestions and encouragement throughout the preparation of this dissertation.

Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Roy Bolduc and Dr. Phillip Clark, members of my supervisory committee, for the time and effort they extended on my behalf.

Warm thanks are extended to Mrs. Lynn Sangster for her outstanding work in typing the drafts and final copy of this dissertation.

To my daughter, Danita, and my fiance, Elbert H. Blackmon, I am grateful for their cooperation and untiring support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES vi

ABSTRACT viii

CHAPTER

I INTRODUCTION 1

- Statement of the Problem 2
- Delimitations and Limitations 5
- Justification for the Study 5
- Definition of Terms 8
- Procedures 9
  - Research Design 9
  - Selection of Schools and Staff 11
  - Profiles of Selected Schools With High Parent Involvement 12
  - Profiles of Selected Schools With Low Parent Involvement 18
  - Summary of Profiles of High and Low Parent Involvement Schools ... 22
  - Instrumentation and Data Collection. 23
  - Data Treatment 25
- Summary 26

II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 28

- Liberal Views on Parental Involvement. 29
- Moderate Views on Parental Involvement 37
- Conservative Views on Parental Involvement 43
- Leadership Styles and Their Measurement 46
- Summary 55

III PRESENTATION OF DATA 58
Descriptive and Demographic Information 59
Associations Between LBDQ Scores and Demographic Characteristics of Principals 77
Associations Between Demographic Characteristics of Principals and Parent Involvement 88
Summary 90

IV CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISCUSSION 93
Findings 96
Administrative Behavior of Principals and Level of Parent Involvement ... 96
Characteristics of School Communities and the Level of Parent Involvement 97
Demographic Characteristics of Principals and Scores on LBDQ 98
Demographic Characteristics of Principals and Level of Parent Involvement 100
Conclusion 102
Implications 103
Recommendations for Further Study 104

APPENDICES

A LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS 106
B DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET 108
C LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE 109
D SCORING KEY 116
E VOLUNTEER SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT 119
BIBLIOGRAPHY 121
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 124

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
ONE	Schools Studied with High Parent Involvement	60
TWO	Schools Studied with Low Parent Involvement	61
THREE	Demographic Data of Principals - Schools with High Parent Involvement	63
FOUR	Demographic Data of Principals - Schools with Low Parent Involvement	64
FIVE	Hypothesis One: Representation ..	68
SIX	Hypothesis Two: Demand Reconciliation	68
SEVEN	Hypothesis Three: Tolerance of Uncertainty	69
EIGHT	Hypothesis Four: Persuasiveness .	69
NINE	Hypothesis Five: Initiation of Structure	71
TEN	Hypothesis Six: Tolerance of Freedom	71
ELEVEN	Hypothesis Seven: Role Assumption	73
TWELVE	Hypothesis Eight: Consideration .	73
THIRTEEN	Hypothesis Nine: Production Emphasis	75
FOURTEEN	Hypothesis Ten: Predictive Accuracy	75
FIFTEEN	Hypothesis Eleven: Integration ..	76

SIXTEEN	Hypothesis Twelve: Superior Orientation	76
SEVENTEEN	Gender of Principals and Variables in LBDQ	79
EIGHTEEN	Age Levels of Principals and Variables in LBDQ	80
NINETEEN	Educational Levels of Principals and Variables in LBDQ	82
TWENTY	Race of Principals and Variables in LBDQ	83
TWENTY-ONE	Principals' Years in School Building and Variables in LBDQ ...	84
TWENTY-TWO	Principals' Years in System and Variables in LBDQ	86
TWENTY-THREE	Summary of Relationships Between Demographic Characteristics and Scores on LBDQ	87
TWENTY-FOUR	High Parent Involvement Schools and Descriptive Variables	89
TWENTY-FIVE	Low Parent Involvement Schools and Descriptive Variables	91

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the
Graduate Council of the University of Florida
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF PRINCIPALS IN SCHOOLS WITH HIGH AND LOW PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

By

Joyce C. Kirkpatrick

March, 1980

Chairman: Dr. Arthur J. Lewis
Major Department: Curriculum and Instruction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the association between administrative characteristics of principals as measured by the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and parent involvement in schools. Data for the study were gathered from the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire and the Volunteer Services Quarterly Report. The LBDQ contains 100 items on which participants rated their principals' behavior on twelve variables using a five point scale.

The extent of parent involvement in the 105 elementary schools of a large southern city was determined from the school district's Volunteer Services Quarterly Report filed quarterly by each elementary principal. Schools

were ranked according to the 1977, 1978 and 1979 reports on number of parent volunteers per quarter and parent volunteer hours contributed per quarter. The eight highest and the eight lowest schools from this ranking were selected for this study.

The average number of parent volunteers per school was 32.39 with the highest number for an individual school being 235 and the lowest being one. The average individual contribution per quarter was 7.71 hours. In the school with the highest parent participation there was an average contribution of 36.61 hours per quarter and in the school with the lowest participation the average contribution was 3.76 hours. The eight schools with the highest parent involvement had an average contribution of 160 hours per week; the eight schools with the lowest parent involvement had an average of 99 hours per week.

The Biomedical Computer Program Class 8D (cross tabulation with variable stacking) was used to test the null hypotheses that no significant difference exists between administrative styles of principals in schools with low parent involvement as compared to principals in schools with high parent involvement. The associations were examined by testing twelve null hypotheses that took the general form:

> There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on representation of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

Other variables stated in this null hypothesis form were demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration and superior orientation. There were no significant differences at the 5% level in administrative characteristics of principals as measured by the LBDQ for principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals assigned to schools with low parent involvement. Therefore, the null hypotheses were not rejected.

A chi-square test for significance on demographic data of principals revealed several areas of significance. In high parent involvement schools the educational levels of principals and number of years they had served in the system were significant. In low parent involvement schools the sex, age, and years served by the principal were significant. Compared with high involvement schools, there were more female principals in low involvement schools and principals tended to be younger and have fewer years of service in the system. Parent involvement was found to be positively associated with the socio-economic status of the school community. Since principals may apply for school assignment based on seniority, the demographic characteristics of principals are associated with the socio-economic status of the community. This may account

for any apparent association between principal characteristics and level of parent involvement.

There is a need to continue to study the administrative behavior characteristics of principals in an effort to discover how principals can improve their effectiveness in encouraging parent involvement.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The nineteen seventies have witnessed changes in school organizations, in school administration and in curriculum implementation. Many of these changes according to some authorities are simply the same orchestra with a new conductor. Taxpayers have complained that the schools are not teaching the three R's (reading, writing and arithmetic); the students are showing their discontent by the large drop-out rate and the destruction of school property. Further, achievement scores are dropping. Citizens complain that the schools are at fault and it is the school's responsibility to correct the educational problems that currently exist.

The cry is change, but change to what? Franklin Bobbitt (1924), referred to by many as the father of curriculum, felt that parents should participate in the educational process and have a voice in shaping the destiny of those procedures. "Schools," Bobbitt wrote, "should do what the community sanctions, and should not go against the community."[1] Donald

---

[1] Franklin Bobbitt, How to Make a Curriculum (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press Company, 1924), pp. 281-83.

Moore (1974) agreed with Bobbitt and proposed that the people who could best change the schools are the parents located in the community. He emphasized that it is the parents who are most concerned over their children's welfare.[2] Accordingly, many educators are seeking ways to increase parent involvement in schools. They are wondering if the leadership behavior of the principal can increase parent involvement.

Statement of the Problem

This study investigates the association between the administrative characteristics of building principals as measured by the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and parent involvement in schools.

The LBDQ yields data regarding principal behavior in relation to representation, demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, and superior orientation. The associations between leadership behavior and parent involvement are examined by testing the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on representation of principals in schools with

---

[2] Donald Moore, "Community Education," NCESA News (May, 1974), p. 10.

high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

2. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on demand reconciliation of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

3. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on tolerance for uncertainty of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

4. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on persuasiveness of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

5. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on initiation of structure of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

6. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on tolerance of freedom of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

7. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on role assumption of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

8. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on consideration of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

9. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on production emphasis of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

10. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on predictive accuracy of principals in schools

with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

11. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on integration of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

12. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on superior orientation of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

Assumptions inherent in the proposed study are both philosophical and empirical. A major assumption underlying this study is that the entire community should have an opportunity for substantive responsible participation in the development and implementation of programs that are intended to improve education. Specific philosophic assumptions are being made about parents' involvement in schools: 1) parents should reflect a sense of personal responsibility and commitment to their children; 2) parents should ask questions concerning the school's program and should have the right to be in the schools assisting, where needed; 3) schools should encourage and maintain a viable parent program for parents to become actively involved; 4) parent assistance in volunteer programs will lead to effective parent involvement in school affairs.

Certain empirical assumptions are being made about the responses of the individuals involved and the data collection instrument used (LBDQ): 1) the instrument will test a range of responses and the answers will reflect feelings of the respondents; 2) sampling 112 teachers in a total of 16 elementary schools constitutes appropriate representation of the school system elementary teaching population.

Delimitations and Limitations

The study has the following delimitations:

1. The study of leadership styles is based on data from 112 teachers located in a single school system in the State of Georgia.
2. The selection of schools was limited to sixteen elementary schools.
3. The leader behaviors measured were restricted to the twelve dimensions measured by the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaires--XII.

The following limitations are recognized in this investigation:

1. Data were gathered from a single urban school system in Georgia; therefore, the generalizations drawn from the data are limited.
2. The data are the perceptions of school staff and not necessarily the actual behavior exhibited by the principal.
3. Participant answers may not reflect true attitudes in an attempt to make the principal appear most democratic.
4. The instrument is long and participants may tire of responding accurately.

Justification for the Study

It is the belief of this researcher, based upon experience as a school administrator, that if schools are to change alternative approaches to the traditional learning process should be developed. Parents should be involved in designing these alternative approaches. It is important, therefore, to study the possible impact of the principal's leadership style on parent involvement.

Community/parent participation in school began in the early nineteenth century. Parents have always worked in various supportive roles with schools; therefore, why all the attention to the parents' view now? Holmes (1972) identified three social changes that make it important for schools to solicit the aid of parents:

1. General urban unrest beginning with the mid-1950s and continuing through the 1960s.
2. Rapid growth in area and population.
3. Federal and state education legislation.[3]

Parents generally know their offspring best and are concerned about their education. One can expect that as a result of direct community involvement and with parents in the schools there will be an increase in the self image of students, greater motivation for learning, reduced problems in decorum and decreased anxiety over the school's curriculum. Parents possess a wealth of knowledge which could be utilized in our schools, especially since mechanization and reduced work loads have given many parents leisure time. Why, then, not use parents in our schools?

---

[3] Emory Holmes, "Community Representation in Education Decision Making: An Exploratory Case Study of School-Community Advisory Councils," in Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 33, No. 4A, June, 1972, p. 1360.

As parent involvement intensifies, many questions and problems will arise. For example, will there be threats from parent involvement in the schools because of conflicts with teachers? What dangers will be faced when parents participate in curriculum planning, educational needs assessment, fiscal planning, and serve on job screening committees?

One of the tasks of the principal is to organize the school in a way that the parents, community, teachers and students are able to accomplish the educational goals set by the school. Because situations change, the principal must lead both in organizing and reorganizing the school in the interest of keeping an effective educational environment. He must work with and through people, drawing upon his understanding of people and using his skills in interpersonal relations.

Since the community is an important force to the school, it is encumbent upon the principal to work with the total school community and more specifically with the parents of the school. He must be able to see the needs and concerns of parents. How effective a principal is in working with parents and their concerns may be related to the principal's administrative style.

The acceptance by staff of citizen groups actively participating in schools can probably be influenced by the principal. The purpose of this study is to investigate the possible relationship between the leadership behavior of the principal as measured by the LBDQ and the extent of parent involvement. The results of such a study could have implications for the selection and training of school principals.

Definition of Terms

1) Leadership Behavior - For the purpose of this study, leadership behavior is defined as teachers' perception of the behavior of the principal as measured by the LBDQ. This instrument measures twelve dimensions of leader behavior defined as follows:

> Representation - speaks and acts as the representative of the group.
>
> Demand Reconciliation - reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to the system.
>
> Tolerance of Uncertainty - is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or becoming upset.
>
> Persuasiveness - uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions.
>
> Initiation of Structure - clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected.
>
> Tolerance of Freedom - allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action.
>
> Role Assumption - actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others.
>
> Consideration - regards the comfort, well being, status, and contributions of followers.
>
> Production Emphasis - applies pressure for productive input.
>
> Predictive Accuracy - exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately.

Integration - maintains a closely knit organization; resolves intermember conflicts.

Superior Orientation - maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status.

2) High Parent Involvement - For the purpose of this study high parent involvement exists when the regular parent activities involve more than two hours a week.

3) Low Parent Involvement - For the purpose of this study low parent involvement exists when the regular parent activities are less than two hours a week.

Procedures

The procedures section is divided into three parts. The first part includes the design of the study and selection of the sample. The second section is an explanation of the development of LBDQ and the data collection process. The final section deals with the treatment of the collected data.

Research Design

The central focus of this research design is to collect and analyze data and determine the degree of correlation between administrative behavior and the degree of parent involvement (dependent variable).

Data from the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) form was analyzed by using the Biomedical

Computer Program Class 8D (cross-tabulation with variable stacking). Output data information from this program included the following:

1. Frequency tables of all combinations of the variables
2. Chi-square values and degrees of freedom for each table
3. Means, standard deviation, and correlation coefficients for each pair of variables

The .05 level of significance was selected for inference evaluation on each investigated category. Findings from this procedure will be presented according to LBDQ variables and categories.

While educational researchers and social scientists have examined these variables, more research needs to be done in order to understand the inter-relationship of these variables to educational policies and practices. The design presented in Figure 1 was constructed in terms of HIGH and LOW parent involvement.

Tests of significance in the study will be concerned with the relationships between these dependent and independent variables. The identification of strong relationships may aid in establishing hypotheses that are amenable to being tested in a more experimentally controlled situation.

FIGURE 1

DEPENDENT AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Dependent Variables--
Parental Involvement

1. High Involvement
2. Low Involvement

Independent Variables--
Administrative
Characteristics
(LBDQ Dimensions)

1. Representation
2. Demand Reconciliation
3. Tolerance of Uncertainty
4. Persuasiveness
5. Initiation of Structure
6. Tolerance of Freedom
7. Role Assumption
8. Consideration
9. Production Emphasis
10. Predictive Accuracy
11. Integration
12. Superior Orientation

Selection of Schools and Staff

There are one hundred and five elementary schools participating in the volunteer services program. The schools were ranked according to the 1977, 1978 and 1979 annual reports, according to (a) number of volunteers per quarter per school, and (b) parent volunteer contribution hours per quarter per school. The eight highest and the eight lowest schools were selected for the study. The average number of volunteers was 32.39 with an average contribution hours of 7.71 per quarter. The highest number of volunteers for an individual school was 235 with lowest being one. Individual school contribution average rate had a high of 36.61 hours and a low of 3.76 hours per quarter. The eight highest involvement schools had an average rate of 160 hours per week; the eight lowest schools had an average of 99 hours per week.

The elementary teachers who participated in the study were identified using a random numbers table; seven teachers were selected from each of the sixteen schools totaling one hundred twelve. The selected teachers received a request through the school mail asking them to complete the LBDQ instrument used in the study and return in a provided sealed envelope to the researcher through the school mail within three days. Within five days 85% of the teachers responded. A follow-up letter was sent to participants that did not return instruments; after the follow-up letter was sent the remaining instruments were returned. The total response was 100%.

Profiles of Selected Schools With High Parent Involvement

Information on school profiles was ascertained from the Bureau of Planning, Department of Budget and Planning, City of Atlanta, 1978, and from elementary school principals.

SCHOOL A

Enrollment: 354
Blacks in Community: 279 (3%)
Blacks in School: 40%

Permanent Capacity: 500
Whites/Other in Community: 10,654 (97%)
Whites in School: 60%

School A was built in 1967 and is located in a remote section of the city. There are 22.8 teachers administered by a white female principal. The building and school grounds are in excellent condition.

Housing Conditions. Approximately 2% of the city's population resides in the area. While black population exists within the school district, it is sparse.

In the last census (1978) most of the homes in the area were single-family (87%) ranging in value from $90,000.00 upward; condominiums comprise the second largest percentage of dwellings (12%). Overall the quality of housing in this area is much higher than the total city housing supply.

General Educational Levels. Approximately 85% of the parents in this school community completed high school and most wage earners are in executive positions.

Business and Industry. AT & T Long lines and two exclusive shopping malls are the only businesses located in the community.

SCHOOL B

Enrollment: 359
Blacks in Community: 285 (1%)
Blacks in School: 40%

Permanent Capacity: 500
Whites/Other in Community: 28,564 (99%)
Whites in School: 60%

School B was built in 1954 and is located in a transitional neighborhood. There are 23.6 teachers administered by a white male principal. The building and school grounds are in excellent condition.

Housing Conditions. The houses in this area are multi-family dwellings (54%), single-family homes (40%), duplexes (4%) and mixed dwellings (2%).

Owner and renter occupied housing in this area is in sound condition. The houses range in value from $50,000.00 to $90,000.00. The duplexes in the area are stately and of medium age; most duplexes have been in the community for two decades or more.

General Educational Levels. Approximately 90% of the parents in the community completed high school and residents are predominantly in mid-level to top executive positions.

Business and Industry. Two exclusive shopping malls are the only business located in the community.

SCHOOL C

Enrollment: 524
Permanent Capacity: 834
Blacks in Community: 19,119 (96%)
Whites/Other in Community: 783 (4%)
Blacks in School: 95%
Whites in School: 5%

School C was built in 1967. There are 30.2 teachers administered by a black male principal. The building and school grounds are in good condition.

Housing Conditions. Over three quarters of the housing in this area is renter occupied. Single-family houses comprise the majority of owner-occupied housing (95%), multi-family dwellings comprise the majority of renter occupied housing (97%).

Deterioration is more common in duplexes than in either single-family or multi-family housing. Sixty-six percent of the housing is in good condition, 15% in need of repair or replacement.

General Educational Levels. Approximately 63% of the parents in this community completed high school; the remaining 37% were high school dropouts.

Business and Industry. There are no major businesses or industries in this school community.

SCHOOL D

Enrollment: 602
Permanent Capacity: 727
Blacks in Community: 25,569 (93%)
Whites/Other in Community: 2,034 (7%)
Blacks in School: 100%
Whites in School: None

School D was built in 1958 with additions in 1961 and 1962. There are 25 teachers administered by a black male principal. The school building and grounds are in excellent condition.

Housing Conditions. The housing within this area is almost equally divided between owner and renter occupancy. Single-family homes comprise a vast majority (99%), multi-family dwellings comprise the majority of renter occupied homes (79%), duplexes (1%).

Overall the majority of housing is in good condition (70%). The remaining 15% is either in need of repair or replacement.

General Educational Levels. Approximately 80% of the wage earners in this school-community completed high school and are professionals in education and business with the remaining 20% in blue collar positions.

Business and Industry. No major business or industry exists in this community.

SCHOOL E

Enrollment: 453
Blacks in Community: 24,493 (94%)
Blacks in School: 100%
Permanent Capacity: 727
Whites/Other in Community: 1,469 (6%)
Whites in School: None

School E was built in 1953. There are 26.8 teachers administered by a black male principal. The school building and grounds are in excellent condition.

Housing Conditions. Housing is comprised of single-family houses (50%), multi-family dwellings (33%), duplexes (16%), and mixed dwellings (1%).

Only 50% of the housing in the area is in standard condition; the remaining 50% is either in need of repair or replacement.

General Educational Levels. Approximately 75% of the parents in the school community completed high school and are blue collar workers with the remaining 25% in laborer positions.

Business and Industry. No major businesses or industries exist in this community.

SCHOOL F

Enrollment: 739
Blacks in Community: 23,804 (98%)
Blacks in School: 100%
Permanent Capacity: 644
Whites/Other in Community: 440 (2%)
Whites in School: None

Schools F and G are located in the same community; demographic data are identical for both schools.

SCHOOL G

Enrollment: 525
Blacks in Community: 23,804 (98%)
Blacks in School: 92%
Permanent Capacity: 644
Whites/Other in Community: 440 (2%)
Whites in School: 8%

School F was built in 1956 with additions in 1966 and 1968. School G was built in 1966. School F has 50.8 teachers and School G has 33.6 teachers. School F is administered by a black male principal; School G is administered by a black female principal. Both schools have numerous federal programs operating in the schools. The buildings and school grounds are in good condition.

Housing Conditions. Housing in the area is comprised of single-family homes (52%), multi-family dwellings (39%), duplexes (8%) and mixed dwellings (1%). Generally the houses in this area are of adequate size and present an acceptable appearance.

General Educational Levels. Approximately 89% of the parents in this community are high school dropouts with the remaining 11% completing high school; the majority in the community are on welfare and are single parents.

Business and Industry. No major businesses or industries exist in this area.

SCHOOL H

Enrollment: 381
Blacks in Community: 16,557 (99%)
Blacks in School: 97%

Permanent Capacity: 669
Whites/Other in Community: 183 (1%)
Whites in School: 3%

School H was built in 1952 with additions in 1955 and 1959. There are 22.8 teachers administered by a black male principal. The building and school grounds are in good condition. School H has numerous federal programs operating in the school.

Housing Conditions. The majority of housing (82%) is renter occupied with the remaining 18% occupied by owners. Single-family homes comprise the majority of owner-occupied housing (61%); multi-family dwellings comprise the majority of renter-occupied housing (70%).

Less than one-third (28%) of the housing within the area is in standard condition; 72% of the units in the area are either in need of repair or replacement.

General Educational Levels. Approximately 90% of the parents in this school community completed high school and are employed as professionals in business, education and engineering.

Business and Industry. No major business or industry exists in this area.

Profiles of Selected Schools With Low Parental Involvement

Schools A, B and C are located in the same community; demographic data are similar for all three schools.

Blacks in Community: 8,052 (52%)

Whites/Other in Community: 7,501 (48%)

SCHOOL A Enrollment: 739 Permanent Capacity: 728
Blacks in School: 75% Whites/Other in School: 25%

SCHOOL B Enrollment: 375 Permanent Capacity: 475
Blacks in School: 96% Whites/Other in School: 4%

SCHOOL C Enrollment: 834 Permanent Capacity: 728
Blacks in School: 87% Whites/Other in School: 14%

School A was built in 1958, Schools B and C in 1954. The schools are administered by: A, a black female; B, a white female; and C, a black female. The school buildings are in good condition. School B contains four portable classrooms. The grounds are in good condition. There are 32.6 teachers in School A, 19.1 teachers in School B, and 31.2 teachers in School C.

Housing Conditions. Housing is comprised of single-family houses (70%), duplexes (16%), multi-family dwellings (13%), and mixed dwellings (1%).

Sixty-three percent of the housing is owner occupied, with the remaining 37% occupied by renters.

Over 58% of the housing is in good condition; 42% is in need of repair or replacement.

General Educational Levels. Approximately 60% of the parents in the community completed high school.

Business and Industry. A General Motors plant is located in this community.

SCHOOL D

Enrollment: 252 Permanent Capacity: 308
Blacks in Community: 26,569 (93%) Whites/Other in Community: 2,034 (7%)
Blacks in School: 100% Whites in School: None

School D was built in 1918 with additions in 1929 and 1935. There are 14.6 teachers in the school administered by a white male. The building is old and not flexible; however, the building is in good condition.

Housing Conditions. Housing within this area is almost equally divided between owner and renter occupancy. Single-family homes comprise a vast majority of renter occupied houses (99%), duplexes comprise 1%.

Overall the majority of housing is in good condition (70%). Approximately 15% is either in need of repair or replacement.

General Educational Levels. Approximately 70% of the parents in the community completed high school.

Business and Industry. No major business or industry exists in this area.

Schools E and F are located in the same community; demographic data are similar for both schools.

Blacks in Community: 19,119 (96%)

Whites/Other in Community: 783 (4%)

SCHOOL E Enrollment: 622 Permanent Capacity: 435
Blacks in School: 100% Whites in School: None

SCHOOL F Enrollment: 438 Permanent Capacity: 744
Blacks in School: 95% Whites in School: 5%

School E was built in 1956 with additions in 1957 and 1959. School F was built in 1951 with additions in 1962 and 1970. There are 27.1 teachers in School E and 24.6 teachers in School F. Both schools are administered by black female principals. The schools are in good condition.

Housing Conditions. Housing is composed of multi-family dwellings (69%), single-family homes (29%), duplexes (3%) and a small number of mixed dwelling units.

Over 78% of the homes are renter occupied. The houses are in standard condition. However, 15% of the housing is in need of repair or replacement.

General Educational Levels. Approximately 60% of the parents completed high school.

Business and Industry. Four construction companies, a brick factory and a cement mixing company are within this community.

Schools G and H are located in the same community; demographic data are similar for both schools.

Blacks in Community: 109 (1%)

Whites/Other in Community: 18,411 (99%)

SCHOOL G Enrollment: 373 Permanent Capacity: 649
Blacks in School: 4% Whites in School: 96%

SCHOOL H Enrollment: 379 Permanent Capacity: 400
Blacks in School: 17% Whites in School: 83%

School G was built in 1960 and School H in 1928 with additions in 1934 and 1958. There are 24.6 teachers in Schools G and H. School G is administered by a white female and School H by a white male. Both schools are in good condition. However, School H is outdated and not flexible.

Housing Conditions. The majority (88%) of housing is in standard condition; 12% of the housing units are either in need of repair or replacement. Both single-family (45%) and duplexes (17%) comprise the majority of housing.

General Educational Levels. Approximately 80% of the parents in this community completed high school; most wage earners are employed in professional positions.

Business and Industry. Two moderately sized shopping centers are located in this community.

Summary of Profiles of High and Low Parent Involvement Schools

It is important to note that the system under study has a predominantly black student enrollment (85%). In the schools where blacks are in attendance in a predominantly white community, or whites in attendance in a predominantly black community, it is because of the Board's Minority to Majority student busing program which began in 1973.

In contrasting low and high parent involvement schools, the educational level of the community appears to be significant. Approximately 95% of parents in high parent involvement communities completed high school while only 75% of those in low parent involvement communities completed high school. Housing conditions were moderately standard in low involvement communities and above average to excellent in high involvement communities. In low parent involvement communities there were several large corporations and industrial plants. Conversely, in high parent involvement communities there were virtually no industries.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

The instrument used in this study was the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form XII developed by Andrew W. Halpin (1963).[4] Descriptions of how leaders behave were obtained through twelve dimensions of leader behavior. The questionnaire consists of one hundred items concerning leadership of the organization to which the respondent belongs. The members of a leader's group indicate the frequency with which he or she engages in each form of behavior by checking one of five adverbs: A-Always; B-Often; C-Occasionally; D-Seldom; E-Never. In brief the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire offers a means of defining leader behavior dimensions operationally, making it possible for the researcher to submit to empirical test specific hypotheses about leader and group behavior. A copy of the instrument is included in Appendix C. In addition to the basic instrument, a demographic data sheet was developed by the Atlanta Public Schools Student Services Division and completed by each of the principals. This questionnaire was for personal data such as sex, age, educational background, ethnic identification, years of experience in the system and years of experience in the school. A copy of the demographic data questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

---

[4] Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966).

The second instrument, the Volunteer Services Quarterly Report, was developed by the volunteer services coordinator in the system under study. Officials in the school system believe that parent involvement could be expanded by developing a system within local schools and programs to identify needs, communicate the needs to the community and effectively utilize the services of citizen groups in meeting these needs. Accordingly, a School Volunteer Program was established by the Board of Education in September, 1974, and professionals were employed to encourage parent participation.

The School Volunteer Program offers a mutually beneficial opportunity for citizens to become meaningfully involved and to participate fully in the educational experience of children. The program is designed to assist school personnel in their efforts to provide the best possible education for each individual child by strengthening the partnership between the school and the community.

Each school-community determines its own individual needs for parent involvement based onpotential resources and the kinds of services to be performed to meet these needs. The presence of federal programs in some schools requires parent involvement. Volunteer recruitment is aimed at local residents, but includes citizens from the entire community. Although parents and other community volunteers serve in middle and high schools, only parents serve as volunteers in elementary schools.

To assist school principals in assessing volunteer recruitment, a Volunteer Services Quarterly Report was devised by the Student-Community Services Division of the Atlanta Public Schools in 1974. The Quarterly Report consists of eleven items in five categories. The items are:

1. Total number of volunteers involved
2. Total number of hours contributed
3. Total number of students served
4. Number of locally recruited volunteers
5. Number of centrally referred volunteers

A copy of the instrument is included in Appendix E.

Data Treatment

Standard data processing procedures were utilized to convert the data from raw forms into a prepared form for analyses. A system was created based on the logical relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The data processing procedure included: (a) accuracy check, (b) distribution procedures, (c) reliability checks, (d) data reduction. The following statistical treatment was performed on the data received:

1. Frequency Distributions. This gave the range of scores or measurements which indicated how the studied population responded to various items on the LBDQ. This is displayed in terms of percentages and proportions.

2. Central Tendency. This function yielded data information concerning the average score (mean), the

midpoint of the range (media) and the highest point of the distribution (mode).

3. Variability. Functions regarding variability described how much relation similarity or variation exists among the measures in the distribution.

4. Analysis of Variance. This function measured how much variation in the data is attributable to the variation within and between studied schools.

Summary

The sample population for this study was composed of sixteen elementary school principals from Atlanta who were administering in the eight schools with highest parent involvement and the eight schools with lowest parent involvement.

The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire--Form XII developed by Andrew W. Halpin was the instrument used to ascertain perceptions of 112 teachers selected at random in sixteen schools regarding the principal's leader behavior. A demographic data sheet was developed to obtain from the selected participants information needed for analysis.

The Volunteer Services Quarterly Report developed by the Student-Community Services Division was used to obtain the sixteen schools used in the study: eight schools with high parent involvement and eight schools with low parent involvement.

Data for the LBDQ were analyzed using the Biomedical Computer Program Class 8B (cross-tabulation with variable stacking). Output data information from this program included the following:

1. Frequency tables of all combinations of the variables;
2. Chi-square values and degrees of freedom for each table;
3. Means, standard deviation, and correlation coefficients for each pair of variables.

The .05 level of significance was selected for inference evaluation on each investigated category.

Chapter Two contains a review of related literature and relative studies pertaining to leadership behavior.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the related literature in school-community involvement reveals that although many contemporary educators support the concept of parent involvement, very few agree in practice or in principle as to the ideal nature of this involvement. Many of the authors and administrators espouse a very liberal attitude concerning school-community involvement and suggest that the public's will should prevail whether or not school staff members view the public's wishes as being desirable and plausible. Still others assume the position that some kind of balance between the wishes of the community and the professional educator's judgment of school related problems be established to enable the school system to benefit from the input of all parties. These writers were characterized as moderate. Finally, there are those writers and educators who feel that educational decisions should be left entirely to the professional educators. The writers who assumed this posture were categorized by the writer as being conservative. It should be noted here that the preceding categories of "liberal," "moderate" and "conservative" are not designed to assign any relative value to one position over the other.

Liberal Views on Parental Involvement

Two of the most ardent contemporary proponents of the "liberal" philosophy of school-community involvement are Ostrander and Dethy.[5] These men left no doubt as to their conviction when they wrote:

> In a free society, government should be the servant of the people. Public schools are units of government and as such they should serve the people as the people decree. Not always will the voters of a local school district make the kind of decisions in respect to educational policy which the administrator believes represents the best interest of either the pupils or of the total society. If, however, he accepts the assumption that the public schools belong to the public, he must abide by its decisions until he can lead the community into more acceptable policies.[6]

Selakovich agreed with Ostrander and Dethy, but went a step further in his discussion of the topic by making the following observations:

> In spite of the increasing influence of the national and state governments on matters of educational policy, the community remains the most important level of decision-making in the operation of the school. Although it is impossible to generalize about American communities, there seems to be a tendency for community influences on schooling to be on the traditional or conservative side. Leaders in positions of power, regardless

---

[5] Ray C. Dethy and Rayland H. Ostrander, A Values Approach to Educational Administration (New York: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co., 1973), p. 209.

[6] Ibid., p. 209.

> of class or other affiliation, tend to be conservative on many issues.[7]

Selakovich believed in community involvement in public education, but he had some serious doubts about the public's willingness to implement meaningful changes in the operation of schools. Kimbrough (1964) made a similar observation when he wrote:

> An hypothesis that might be supported in many communities is that the power wielding group and/or individual in any given community tends to be on the traditional end of a traditional-emergent value continuum.[8]

In spite of the serious concerns expressed by Selakovich and Kimbrough about the conservative nature of people who are selected or elected to represent the community, Olsen (1954) reaffirmed the need for school-community participation by writing:

> Education cannot be identified solely with schooling, nor learning with formal instruction. That is why "education in a democracy" cannot be much more than a delusive verbalism unless it is everywhere grounded in appropriate community-wide and community guided actions.[9]

Olsen argued for community involvement in various community activities. He provided some valuable historical data on the development of citizen participation in public agencies.

---

[7] Daniel Selakovich, The Schools and American Society (Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdelle Publishing Company, 1967), p. 56.

[8] Ralph B. Kimbrough, Political Power and Educational Decision-Making (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964), p. 25.

[9] Edward G. Olsen, School and Community (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954), p. 445.

> The first coordination . . . was formally organized in Berkeley, California in 1919. It was developed by the superintendent of schools and the chief of police in order to secure community-wide participation in more effectively meeting the problems of youth in that city. By 1940, over three hundred local coordinating councils had been organized in 26 states. Today, they number several thousands, listed under a variety of names - "Community Council," "Neighborhood Council," "Human Relations Council," and the like.[10]

The preceding statement by Olsen puts community involvement with public agencies into its proper historical perspective.

Foster (1971), former Superintendent of the Oakland Public Schools, was among those educators who supported the concept of meaningful school-community involvement. Foster, before his assassination, was an unswerving supporter of community power in assisting schools to better meet the needs of students. In his discussion of this topic, Foster noted: "I am a great believer in the power of the total school-community--staff, students, parents, and interested citizens." In the same book, Foster stated that, "In any kind of school setting, if the community believes that nothing is happening, then in fact, for them nothing is happening."[11] Thus, one can readily see that Foster believed that it was incumbent upon school districts, especially those districts in urban areas, to establish mechanisms not to inform the community but to ensure a two-way communication system between the schools and the community. Foster summarized his position when he wrote:

---

[10] Ibid., p. 448.

[11] Marcus A. Foster, Making Schools Work (Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1971), p. 10.

> A school insulated from its community never was a good idea. Nowadays, it is impossible. The people must have meaningful roles in making decisions in order for them to have legitimate means of expressing their power.[12]

In spite of the strong stand Foster took on the need for meaningful school-community involvement, he did identify constraints that many public school administrators should remember.

> Schools are state institutions. We are bound by state statutes; many of our powers simply cannot be given to the communities. But we can share, in increasingly effective ways, our decision-making prerogatives.[13]

The discussion up to this point has not dealt with those persons who would be placed on the extreme left end of the continuum of liberal thinkers in school-community involvement such as Ivan Illich. Illich expressed his views concerning the rights of citizens in public education in the following statement:

> We need a guarantee of the right of each citizen to an equal share of tax derived educational resources, the right to verify his share, and the right to sue for it, if denied. It is one form of a guarantee against repressive taxation.[14]

---

[12] Ibid., p. 103.

[13] Ibid., p. 158.

[14] Ivan Illich, Deschooling Society (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970), p. 16.

Illich was not talking about schools simply sharing their "decision-making prerogatives" with the community or calling the community in to assist the schools on controversial issues. Illich was talking about the need for citizens to have a guaranteed right to ascertain how tax dollars are spent and the right to sue the state if it fails to perform its responsibilities effectively. Illich pointed out still another foible in present school-community relations by noting: "Educational reformers promise each new generation the latest and the best, and the public is schooled into demanding what they offer."[15] This, according to Illich, is one of the fallacies of the present relationship between the schools and the community.

Oliver, in his discussion of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville situation in Brooklyn, New York, expressed views similar to those of Illich when he wrote:

> Community control is that phase of human government in which a community of persons takes an active part in the government of their affairs. In its broadest sense, it extends to the total life of the community (political, economic, social, religious) and embraces the most basic needs of a well-ordered society.[16]

---

[15] Ibid., p. 102.

[16] Sheldon Marchs and Harry N. Rivlin, eds., Conflicts in Urban Education (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1970), p. 111.

In brief, according to Oliver, "The concept of community control is of the very essence of Western democracy. It is nothing more or less than local self-government."[17]

Fantine, Gittell, and Magot agreed with Oliver when they wrote:

> Both the schools and the parents and community participants themselves benefit from their active involvement in the education process. Their very act of meaningful participation--a sense of greater control over a decisive institution that influences the fate of their children--contributes to parent's sense of potency and self-worth.[18]

Thus Fantine and his colleagues view community participation in the schools as being mutually beneficial to all parties (schools, parents, and community participants). It appears that this position is being taken, not entirely because it will help students, but because it gives the community "a sense of greater control" over educational institutions. Fantine, Gittell, and Magot reaffirmed this contention when they wrote:

> Participation democracy in education should also instill in parents and the community, a new respect for the complexity of the professional problems in urban education. Responsibility comes with the power of effective voice and, in its train should follow judgment, stability, and dedication to constructive purposes.[19]

---

[17] Ibid., p. 113.

[18] Mario Fantine, Marilyn Gittell, and Richard Magot, Community Control and Urban Schools (New York: Praeger Publishing, Inc., 1970), p. 95.

[19] Ibid., p. 96.

Marburger, a nationally known educator, is an adamant supporter of community involvement in public education. In fact, Marburger's most profound comments on the problems of urban public schools are outlined in the following statement:

> What, then, is wrong with the "urban school structure"? All too frequently, such school systems are not responsive to the demands of the parents and the children that they serve. Their leaders too often treat their public trust, not as public property, but as earned by some "divine right". . . . All too many of the teachers and administrators in these systems are locked into a fervent struggle for status, and display loyalty first to their profession and only secondly to their charges.[20]

This statement by Marburger is a serious indictment of urban public school systems. One cannot avoid concluding that there is still much to be done in urban schools to improve the status, viability and credibility of urban administrators and systems. According to Marburger: "There is only one overriding way in which we (public school administrators) can win back this trust--and that is by vastly improving the quality of education."[21]

Allen, former President of the Washington, D.C., Board of Education from January, 1970, to November, 1971, expressed concerns similar to those of Marburger when she wrote:

---

[20] A. Harry Passow, ed., Urban Education in the 1970's (New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1971), p. 143.

[21] Ibid., p. 145.

> Personally, I tend to hold the paid professionals and the lay board of education primarily responsible for the caliber of our public schools, because society and parents and students have placed their confidence in them. It is the professionals who in the first instance must try to accomplish what needs to be accomplished to improve public education.[22]

Again, one is reminded of tremendous responsibilities that urban schools have in providing the leadership required to enhance student learning and effectuate more meaningful school-community relations. In the same article, Allen discussed the role of schools in the 1970's:

> The schools in short, have a new role to play in the 1970's. They must become the advocates for children vis-a-vis the society as a whole. This means that the failure of the public education cannot be excused by pointing to the shortcomings of the world around us. On the contrary, schools must not be judged on the basis of their effectiveness in performing the traditional task--that of freeing the mind--while at the same time acting as public spokesman for children and their parents.[23]

Allen identified a perennial problem facing many school systems when she wrote: "The educational bureaucracy is truly self-perpetuating, omniscient, and omnipotent. It counts on being able to outlast any superintendent and any board member, and generally can."[24] The preceding statement has even greater credibility today (1980) than it did in the early 70's.

---

[22] Jim Haskin and Anita Allen, eds., Black Manifesto For Education (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1973), p. 59.

[23] Ibid., p. 60.

[24] Ibid., p. 69.

Before reviewing those writers and educators who have been categorized as "moderates" in the area of school-community involvement, the profound words of Philip Meranto appear appropriate when he wrote, ". . . the future of education in our large cities will hinge upon the outcome of several political struggles. At the local level, conflict will center on who controls the school system."[25]

Moderate Views on Parental Involvement

Looking now at those educators categorized as being "moderate" in their views, it should be noted that 1) an inordinate number of educators and writers could be placed in this category; accordingly, no attempt was made to cite all of the writers in this category; and 2) the line between liberals and moderates is often indistinct.

In 1975 Sidney Estes addressed the specific concerns of many urban administrators when he wrote:

> Effective inner-city education cannot be isolated from parents, the immediate community, or the community-at-large. Community control is one thing, but community accountability is another. The education of children is a two-way street.

---

[25] Philip J. Meranto, School Politics in the Metropolis (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1970), p. 157.

> Communities should be accountable to the schools, and the schools must be accountable to the communities.[26]

Estes, as Superintendent for Instruction in the Atlanta Public School System, spoke with authority and strong personal commitment for improvement in school-community involvement. Estes reiterated his convictions concerning the need for improved relations between the public schools and the community by making the following observation:

> Large urban school systems are predominantly "Minority" populated. This knowledge means that these systems should be revamped and restructured to adjust to the reality that maintaining the "status quo" is no longer appropriate.[27]

The former Superintendent of the Dallas Independent School District, Nolan Estes, gave additional support and credence to the observations made by Sidney Estes (no relation) when he wrote:

> The day is past when we can open our doors to citizens only during American Education Week and close our minds to what they are saying about how their money is being spent and what we are doing with their children. I feel that it is imperative for us to find ways to reconnect the schools and the community.[28]

---

[26] Sidney H. Estes, "Instruction Inner-City: Where It's Really At!" Educational Leadership, 32 (March, 1975), p. 387.

[27] Ibid., p. 384.

[28] Nolan Estes, "Operation-Citizen Involvement Spells Help For School Challenges," Educational Leadership, 31 (January, 1974), p. 365.

In addition to Nolan Estes' belief in providing a mechanism for ensuring meaningful community participation in the schools, he pointed out one of the major advantages of fostering school-community partnerships. According to Nolan Estes: "People, even in large urban systems, such as the Dallas Independent School District, support the decisions that they helped to make. The model gives much promise."[29] In the same article, Nolan Estes provided another plausible explanation for involving the community in school problems by noting: ". . . the way to change many of our severest critics into our staunchest supporters is by giving them a piece of the action and by getting them actively involved in seeking solutions and meeting the challenge."[30]

Hunter provided insight into this posture when he explained his definition of social planning.

> Social Planning means that groups and individuals who are concerned with issues, projects and community problems may organize into effective bodies to discuss issues, coordinate opinions, help lay out policy to cover specific problems, and lay out alternative ways of action to meet a given social need.[31]

---

[29] Ibid., p. 365.

[30] Ibid., p. 365.

[31] Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1953), pp. 233-34.

Although Hunter emphasized the role that social planning played in formulating policies and developing alternative ways of addressing social needs, he also identified some critical factors that school public relations staffers should consider. According to Hunter, the following observations would assist educators in avoiding the traditional pitfalls that are often encountered:

> The task of social reconstruction may never be finished once and for all. It is a recurring task confronting each generation, which somehow manages to find courage to meet social issues as they arise. In spite of the limitations that confront the individual in relation to community participation on the level of policy decision, there is still room for him in this area.[32]

Litwak and Meyer expressed their concern about the reluctance of public school bureaucracies to change when they observed:

> We have been made particularly aware in recent years that our public school systems, or the individual schools that compose them are not necessarily in tune with the needs and demands of the people they presume to serve.[33]

Barth in his discussion of the changing role of inner-city schools and school-community involvement provided practical advice that public school administrators should heed:

---

[32] Ibid., p. 260.

[33] Eugene Litwak and Henry J. Meyer, School, Family and Neighborhood: The Theory and Practices of School Community Relations (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974), p. 33.

> Although school administrators are inclined to view greater parental involvement in the educational process as a threat, there is evidence that such involvement can provide strong support, pedagogically as well as politically for programs intended to help inner-city children.[34]

According to Barth: "In the inner-city there is no longer a question of whether the school system wants to or will allow parents to participate in educational decisions affecting their children. Parents are participating."[35] Unfortunately, this reality has not been accepted by many public school officials. The failure of school administrators to espouse this philosophy could be an explanation for some of the problems school administrators face when they seek additional financial support for the schools and are rejected by the public. If nothing else, past experience should teach educators that the public tends to support those institutions that they feel are productive and serving their specific need.

As school, home and community work closely together and understand their common problems, many difficulties which the school now wrestles with, and others that trouble the pupils, will disappear.[36] Again one is inclined to believe if educators were wise they would seize the opportunity to convince the community that their assistance is needed. In fact, most of the writers in the moderate category suggested that this approach was the most tenable. Carnoy, however, took a more radical stand in criticizing all schools by making the following observations:

---

[34] Roland S. Barth, Open Education and the American School (New York: Agathon Press, Inc., 1972), p. 194.

[35] Ibid., p. 195.

[36] Sidney L. Pressey, Psychology in Education (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959), p. 485.

> We contend that the school's function is to reinforce social relations . . . and that no school reform can be separated from the effect it will have on the hierarchical relations in society. . . . The success of educational reforms, in turn, depends on the relation of those reforms to change in the economic and social structures.[37]

Carnoy has expressed some serious doubts about the ability of public schools to institute meaningful change. His major contention is that it is useless to talk about reforming the schools if one fails to effectuate changes in the economic and social structures that impact upon public education. Unfortunately, many contemporary educators who may not agree wholly with Carnoy are expressing similar concerns.

Clark expressed a similar view as he urged the public to adopt a multi-faceted approach to addressing and resolving its problems. His observation related to the public's tendency to give too much credit to the research and/or proposed solutions of social scientists. According to Clark: "The public must be alerted to the vulnerabilities--the human fallibilities of social scientists. There must be continued reliance upon the political, the legislative, and the judicial apparatuses in spite of their imperfections--for determinations on matters of equity and justice."[38] All three writers agree that effective decision making must be broadly based or diverse.

---

[37] Martin Carnoy, Education as Cultural Imperialism (New York: David McKay, Inc., 1974), p. 343.

Conservative Views on Parental Involvement

A major proponent of conservative philosophy in school-community relations is Weinberg, who made the following observation:

> Education . . . cannot do its work by following the mandates of political expediency or even community response. But the major changes in educational structures need to flow from an internal rather than an external set of demands. The community and for the most part well-meaning political figures only vaguely understand the dynamics of process; they do respond with spirit to a conception of profit.[39]

The preceding statement is typical of how many conservative educators view political and community input. Blau and

---

[38] Kenneth B. Clark, "Social Policy, Power and Social Research," Harvard Education Review, 43 (February, 1973), pp. 120-21.

[39] Carl Weinberg, Education and Social Problems (New York: The Free Press, Collier-Macmillan Limited, 1971), p. 176.

Scott responded to this kind of conservative thinking as they wrote:

> It is ironic . . . that the motto "the customer is always right" originated in those organizations which may legitimately consider its owners and managers as prime beneficiaries, whereas the service organizations--whose prime beneficiary is the client in contact--do not, in general, allow their "customer" either to diagnose or prescribe. The service organizations typically are manned by professionals who are presumed to know the client's true needs better than he.[40]

In essence, Blau and Scott are questioning the right of professionals, particularly those in service organizations as the public schools, social services agencies, etc., to reject input from the people they serve.

Schiller presented an explanation for those professionals who are reluctant to seek and utilize advice from their clients by pointing out: "The flow of information in a complex society is a source of unparalleled power. It is unrealistic to imagine that control of this power will be relinquished readily."[41] Schiller is implying that many "professionals" are elitist and view political and community input as being an attack upon hard earned and well deserved power.

---

[40] Brenda Danet and Elihu Katz, eds., Bureaucracy and the Public (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1971), p. 176.

[41] Herbert I. Schiller, The Mind Managers (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973), p. 6.

Williams pointed out that regardless of whether a system is liberal, moderate or conservative in its approach to school-community involvement, the following advice should be considered:

> Before involving the community in any change endeavor the persons initiating such action should clearly understand the change concepts they advocate and be able to articulate those concepts.[42]

The foregoing advice is particularly helpful since many educators whose views are conservative in community relations assume this posture because they do not feel comfortable and/or competent enough to take their ideas to the public for review and approval. Many writers agree with the arguments of the conservatives. Johns, Morphet and Reller discussed the issue--"Is There Danger that Public Opinion Will Be Too Large a Determiner of Educational Practice?" Although these writers stated emphatically that they believe in meaningful school-community involvement, they observed:

> There is a danger that uninformed public opinion or perhaps a small but highly vocal group will have too large an influence on educational practice. . . . The individual or group with the greatest pressure potential does not necessarily have the sound answer.[43]

---

[42] Charles T. Williams, "Involving the Community in Implementing Pluralism," Educational Leadership, 32 (December, 1974), p. 170.

[43] Roe L. Johns, Edgar Morphet and Theodore Reller, Educational Administration: Concepts, Practices and Issues (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974), p. 50.

Some educators who are staunch supporters of school-community relations have doubts about putting too much power into the hands of the public. Johns, Morphet, and Reller expanded on their convictions by noting: "The development of sound educational practices demands that there be recognition of the limitations of the expert. . . . It also requires that the contribution of experts be recognized and capitalized upon."[44] What is being suggested by the writers is that in spite of problems in adopting a school-community involvement process, respect and reason should prevail in both camps, i.e., among professional educators and laymen (community).

In conclusion, the work of those writers and educators who have been categorized as liberals, moderates, and conservatives has been reviewed. Regardless of the view (liberal, moderate, conservative) taken by the educator, problem solving and human relations skills will be important to principals as they relate to the community. The next section of this review describes studies related to leadership characteristics of principals.

Leadership Styles and Their Measurement

Administrators, similar to all human beings, act in an environment where the conditions are never completely known. Psychologists say physical conditions, the color of the room, lighting, all have their effect upon what people do. In this section the writer will not attempt the role of psychologist or psychiatrist in explaining or dealing with the variables of human behavior. Nevertheless, since the administrator's "trade" is human relationships, his or her behavior should have a sound psychological base. According to Campbell, Bridges and Nystrand, an administrator's behavior is dependent upon the interaction of the conditions within the person and those which surround him. Allpert's field theory is similar to what many psychologists refer to as an "open system" in which one's own fund of understanding forms the basis for his understanding of the world around him.[45] In turn, what he perceives in the outside world affects his inner self. To understand human behavior one must know something about field theory. Campbell stated: "The characteristics of the field are not directly observable. They must be inferred from the observations of people who, themselves, are a part of this field."[46]

---

[44] Ibid., pp. 143-44.

To illustrate this in educational administration, take the hypothetical case of two administrators who at different times held the same position but who performed in very different ways. For one, the position presented the challenge through which he successfully developed his leadership potential. The other probably found the position uninteresting and limited in opportunity. In this case, the person in the situation made the difference. In essence, Campbell's position on factors influencing administrative behavior can be categorized as an administrator's 1) perception of others, 2) perception of self, 3) value and beliefs, and 4) concepts of success.[47]

---

[45] Ibid., p. 293.

[46] Ibid., p. 291.

According to Bartky, the nature of the principal's leadership in the community will vary with his social philosophy.[48] This, of course, is not the only factor determining the principal's leadership. For example, the smaller the school district, the more likely it is that the public will be interested in how schools are run. On the other hand, small school districts sometimes are impractical from the view of finance and supervision.

Thus far, the writer has stated that supervisory behavior is likely to be predicated upon philosophical, sociological and psychological assumptions. What, then, are the various assumptions that result in different types of supervisory personalities? According to Campbell, there are six types of supervisory behavior:

---

[47] Ibid., p. 292.

[48] John L. Bartky, Administration as Educational Leadership (California: Stanford University Press, 1956), p. 203.

1. Authoritarian Supervision
2. Representative Supervision
3. Cooperative-Democratic Supervision
4. Invitational Supervision
5. Scientific Supervision
6. Creative Supervision[49]

Additionally, according to Campbell, a leader leads people and cannot rely upon a stereotyped set of behaviors. To be effective a leader needs to know the personalities of the staff working under him and at the same time he needs to show a positive self image.

Realizing the importance of positive personality traits the writer reviewed several personality inventories. The review presented here does not exhaust the inventories available nor indicate a preference of one over the other. Instead it is the writer's purpose of relating to the reader why personality tests are useful and to suggest a few ways that personality test results may be of value to administrators.

In 1976, two psychologists, Chevers and Fiedler, developed an instrument to measure leadership called the "Leader Match Concept," commonly known as the LPC. They found that most people are effective in some leadership situations and not in others.

---

[49] Op. cit., p. 216.

> The psychologists believe the key to being an effective leader "is identifying your own leadership style and the situations in which you are likely to succeed--as well as learning to deal with situations in which you are apt to be ineffective."[50]

Based on laboratory tests, they found that people's leadership styles were revealed in their "LPC ratings." To ascertain an LPC rating an administrator indicates his feelings regarding administration by ranking eighteen attributes[51] on a scale of 1 to 8. If the person's score is fifty-seven or below, he or she is generally more concerned with tasks than with the quality of interpersonal relations.

One of the most distinctive findings of Chevers and Fiedler was that charismatic leaders of revolutions generally tend to be high LPCs.[52] For example, according to Chevers and Fiedler, former President Nixon is a high LPC--reacted by closing off information channels and using restrictive structures and strategies in handling situations. However, subsequent appraisals of Nixon suggest he was not a charismatic leader.

Lyndon Johnson was high LPC and had great abilities in the areas of persuasion. Chevers' and Fiedler's model predicts that a high LPC tends to become overwhelmed and give up leadership when he finds himself in a bad situation with shrinking support.[53]

---

[50] Martin M. Chevers and Fred E. Fiedler, "Your Style of Leadership," Scientific Digest, 82, No. 2 (August, 1977), p. 46.

[51] Ibid., p. 46.

[52] Ibid., p. 48.

In the study by Gouldner, problems relating to leadership traits were addressed. Among them were apathy versus involvement, participation, planning and innovation. His study showed that leaders are expected to advance the group objectives, show administrative competence, and motivate group activities. If a leader is young, he is expected to show initiative, creativity, and daring to reject tradition; if he is older, his actions will make for group maintenance and stability.

In contrast, Cartwright and Zander compared leadership characteristics with group norms and found that leaders are bigger, but not much bigger, brighter, but not much brighter, and somewhat better adjusted than their fellow workers.[54]

Gibb's study showed that leadership characteristics may be determined by superiority in physical and constitutional factors (height, weight, appearance, intelligence, ambition, creativity, etc.). Further, emergent leaders showed more autocratic traits than imposed leaders.

---

[53] Ibid., p. 49.

[54] Darwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, Group Dynamics Research and Theory (New York: Addison and Wesley, 1954), p. 887.

Finally, Cattell's study contrasted the stories of Gibb and Gouldner in that he found that the effectiveness of a leader is only measured in terms of performance in groups under the leader.[55]

The leadership Q-Sort Test developed by William Stephenson in 1953 was designed to assess individual values with respect to the leadership role. "The 60 items which are contained in the test have been identified as being important to the leadership function."[56] The test was administered to multiple groups of outstanding leaders to ascertain the norm. By comparing the individual's rating on the test items with the appropriate test norms a meaningful evaluation is obtained of his or her leadership values and notions. The characteristic decision making patterns are provided by the total score of an individual.[57] "The basic ideas of this test are worthwhile--namely, that what a person considers to be important to leadership will be reflected in his competency as a leader."[58] The Q-Sort Test agrees with Cattell's leadership studies. However, the difference in Cattell's test and the Q-Sort Test is that the latter test is most often administered in institutional settings rather than with the kind of population with which most users would like to deal.

---

[55] Cecil Gibb, "Leadership," Handbook of Social Psychology (New York: Addison and Wesley, 1954), p. 887.

[56] Joel T. Campbell, Educational Testing Service (Princeton, New Jersey, 1958), p. 1558.

[57] Ibid., p. 1087.

[58] Ibid., p. 1088.

The Leadership Ability Evaluation (LAE) Test designed in 1961 addresses the three leadership styles: laissez faire, democratic and autocratic decision patterns. It contains fifty leadership situations. "Total scores of ten and lower are indicative of ineffective leaders." John D. Black in his critique of the LAE feels that the test does not deal with relevant leadership situations, the formula is cumbersome and the rigid cut off score inadequate.[59]

A simple instrument to measure leadership styles of principals as these styles relate directly to high and low parent involvement is not available. Most leadership studies showed that it is best to study leadership patterns in different situations and none linked the study to parent involvement. Accordingly, the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) developed by Halpin appears to best suit the research design.

According to Halpin the literature on educational administration leadership is complicated since many writers use the term "value theory" to refer to how administrators behave but not to how they ought to behave.[60] Administration according to Halpin refers to a human activity that involves a minimum of four components:

---

[59] John D. Black, "The Leadership Ability Evaluation," Personality Tests and Reviews (New Jersey: The Cryphon Press, 1970), p. 1083.

1. Task
2. The Formal Organization
3. The Work (or Work Groups)
4. The Leader (or Leaders)[61]

Based on these components, Halpin built his LBDQ.

The LBDQ instrument was used first in a series of studies of aircraft commanders. However, related studies have been conducted in education. In these studies the findings supported the basic hypotheses that educational administrators differ from aircraft commanders in both leadership ideology and leadership style. The administrators tended to show greater consideration and less initiating of structure than the commanders.[62] The evidence from Halpin's studies showed that effective leadership is first of all characterized by high initiation of structure and high consideration. The studies further suggest that it should be possible to train leaders in the skills that compose these dimensions, but the method of accomplishing this training has yet to be developed.

---

[60] Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), p. 63.

[61] Ibid., p. 68.

[62] Op. cit., p. 126.

The LBDQ does not exhaust the field, since the researcher feels that the dimensions measured by this instrument do not constitute the only criteria that should be taken into account in evaluating the leadership skills of principals. However, by using the LBDQ, the researcher obtained an analysis of the behavior of leaders. This enabled the researcher to observe and make assumptions about those characteristics that are desirable in principals. This instrument provides a description of how principals behave which the researcher can study in relation to parental involvement.

Summary

It is generally accepted by educators, administrators and citizens that school-community involvement has some merit; however, these opinions are varied and were placed by the researcher in this study into three categories: liberal, moderate, and conservative. The categories were not designed to assign values to one position over or against the other and may not be considered absolute.

Liberal views were supported by Dethy, Foster, Selakovich, Olsen, Illich, Sheldon, Fantine, Passow and Haskin. In essence it was felt by the aforementioned persons that citizens are the most important group to consider in matters concerning educational policy and decision-making and that all education need not take place in the classroom.

Moderate views were supported by Meranto, Sidney Estes, Nolan Estes, Hunter, Litwak, Barth, Pressey, Carnoy and Clark. Unlike the liberal positions, moderate views are that a mechanism should be provided by school systems for ensuring parental participation in schools; this participation should be in the form of a school-community partnership.

Conservative views were supported by Weinberg, Danet, Schiller, Williams and Johns. Views shared by conservatives contrasted the opinions of liberals and moderates; conservative positions would eliminate parental/community groups from formulating educational policies. While large groups may make a lot of noise they are not always the best equipped to resolve educational concerns or formulate policy.

The literature was reviewed to ascertain factors that would facilitate principals in relating to the community. Since principals' trade is human relations, a review of leadership styles was examined. Leadership may be considered the act of influencing activities in its efforts toward goal achievement. Additionally, leadership cannot be stereotyped. The style depends upon the task to be performed and the difficulty involved. However, leadership styles can largely be categorized as democratic, autocratic and laissez faire.

Halpin's Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was chosen by the researcher from among several instruments to test the hypotheses presented in Chapter I.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

In 1869 the Atlanta City Council established the Atlanta Public Schools. The system was composed of eight schools designed for white children. Three years later the Board took over the responsibility for the education of blacks from the Freeman's Bureau when it was dismantled. A dual system of educating youths was maintained until 1871 when the slow process of desegregation began. However, the City of Atlanta maintained the dual separate school system until 1966.

The Atlanta Public School System is headed by a nine member elected Board. Six of the positions are filled in district elections; the remaining three are four year term positions and are elected city wide representatives. Meetings are generally held by the Board twice monthly. The duties and responsibilities of the Board are ambiguously stated in the charter, thus giving the Board freedom to administer the system.

The Atlanta Public School System employs approximately 4,000 teachers, administrators and staff to serve a school population of 80,000 students. There are 105 elementary schools, 8 middle schools and 22 high schools. The budget for fiscal year 1979 was $133,935,636. There were four administrative areas, each with an area superintendent, until August, 1979, when the number of areas was reduced to three because of financial problems and declining student enrollment.

Descriptive and Demographic Information

Sixteen elementary schools in Atlanta were selected for this study on the basis of the number of parent volunteers per school in proportion to the percentage of students served over a three year period. The eight schools with the highest parent involvement and the eight with the lowest parent involvement were used in this study.

Although the Board mandated a parent involvement policy during the academic school year 1973-74 it was not until 1977 that a form was devised to monitor parent/community involvement in the schools.

Table one shows the total number of volunteer hours spent in the eight high involvement schools over a three year period, 1977 to 1979. Schools C, D, F and G experienced dramatic shifts in extent of parent involvement. This is not a reflection of changes in administration since all of the principals had been in the schools at least two years before being informed that data on parent involvement would be collected quarterly. However, the principal of school C had a heart attack in 1978 and in 1979, leaving the school staff without principal leadership for some time. Finally, the principal in school G was on sabbatical leave for one half of the school year in 1977 while completing a specialist degree.

TABLE ONE

Schools Studied with High Parent Involvement

Schools	Number of Volunteers			
	1977	1978	1979	Total
Elemen. - A	171	191	123	485
Elemen. - B	126	117	90	333
Elemen. - C	264	72	87	423
Elemen. - D	48	165	339	552
Elemen. - E	171	144	102	417
Elemen. - F	201	222	151	574
Elemen. - G	66	129	165	360
Elemen. - H	69	162	90	321
TOTAL	1116	1202	1147	3465

On a quarterly basis an average of 1,155 volunteers rendered academic and personal services to 3,569 students. Volunteers spent on the average of 3.18 hours each quarter per student.[63]

---

[63] Volunteer Services Quarterly Report.

Table two shows that the eight schools with low parent involvement provided services to 2,579 students with an average of 255 volunteers on a quarterly basis. Volunteers spent on the average 1.28 hours with individual students. There is a service hour difference of 1.90 between the eight elementary schools with low parent involvement and the eight elementary schools with high parent involvement with the difference in the number of students served per quarter being 990.

TABLE TWO

Schools Studied with Low Parent Involvement

Schools	Number of Volunteers			
	1977	1978	1979	Total
Elemen. - A	9	12	9	30
Elemen. - B	9	33	12	54
Elemen. - C	9	51	15	75
Elemen. - D	12	93	21	126
Elemen. - E	18	33	21	72
Elemen. - F	24	54	54	132
Elemen. - G	36	27	69	133
Elemen. - H	45	24	75	144
TOTAL	162	327	276	765

Table three shows that principals in high involvement schools had served an average of 4.75 years while their length of service in the school system averaged 15.9 years. Seventy-five percent of the principals were black and 25% were white. Conversely, 75% of the principals were males and 25% were females. The educational levels were high, 62.5% earning the educational specialist or doctorate degree and 37.5% earning the master's degree. The average age for principals in schools studied with high parent involvement was 46.4 years.

Table four shows that principals in low involvement schools had served an average of 4.25 years, while their length of service in the school system averaged 15.9 years. Half of the principals in the study were black and half were white. However, 75% were female and 25% were males. Seven of the eight principals (87.5%) had master's degrees; only one had an educational specialist degree. The average age for principals of schools studied with low parent involvement was 42.6 years.

Testing of Hypotheses

The purpose of this study was to investigate the associations between the administrative characteristics of building principals as measured by the LBDQ and parent involvement in schools.

TABLE THREE

Demographic Data of Principals - Schools with High Parent Involvement

Name of School	Years in School	Length of Time in System	Race	Sex	Educational Level	Age
A	5	15	White	Female	M.S.	43
B	4	20	White	Male	Ed.S.	54
C	8	20	Black	Male	M.S.	52
D	5	10	Black	Male	Ed.S.	45
E	3	15	Black	Male	M.A.	40
F	5	12	Black	Male	Ed.S.	45
G	4	23	Black	Female	Ed.D.	53
H	4	12	Black	Male	Ed.S.	39

TABLE FOUR

Demographic Data of Principals - Schools with Low Parent Involvement

Name of School	Years in School	Length of Time in System	Race	Sex	Educational Level	Age
A	6	10	Black	Female	M.A.	46
B	2	8	White	Female	M.A.	38
C	4	20	Black	Female	M.A.	47
D	8	15	White	Male	M.A.	37
E	2	12	Black	Female	M.A.	38
F	2	22	Black	Female	M.A.	42
G	5	17	White	Female	M.A.	46
H	5	23	White	Male	Ed.S.	48

Halpin in the development of the LBDQ grouped twelve variables into three categories. These categories and variables were used for data analysis and interpretation to provide structure and greater clarity to conclusions and implications. The meanings ascribed to the variables are given in Chapter I.

Category I

Definition: Administrative characteristics that refer to representative actions, management demands, unknown events and personal persuasion.

Variables:

1. Representation
2. Demand Reconciliation
3. Tolerance of Uncertainty
4. Persuasiveness

Category II

Definition: Administrative characteristics that refer to role expectations, staff creativity, leadership roles and personal concerns.

Variables:

1. Initiation of Structure
2. Tolerance of Freedom
3. Role Assumption
4. Consideration

Category III

Definition: Administrative characteristics that refer to leadership outputs, leadership accuracy, orientation and organizational perceptions.

Variables:

1. Production Emphasis
2. Predictive Accuracy
3. Integration
4. Superior Orientation

This section presents statistical evaluation and analytical data used to test the hypotheses using the mean, standard deviation and chi-square. The following are used in tables:

1. N = Number of responses
2. $\overline{X}$ = Mean
3. S.D. = Standard Deviation
4. X^2 = Chi-Square
5. D.F. = Degrees of Freedom
6. * = Significant difference (.05 level)
7. N.S. = No significant difference

The associations between principal leadership behavior as measured by the LBDQ and parent involvement were tested by stating twelve null hypotheses. Each hypothesis will be given followed by the data and an interpretation.

1. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on representation of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

Table five reports results of responses on representation in terms of high and low parent involvement. Data collected indicate there is no significant difference at the .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis number one cannot be rejected. However, low parent involvement schools had a higher mean score on representation than schools with high parent involvement.

> 2. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on demand reconciliation of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

Table six reports results of responses from demand reconciliation in terms of high and low parent involvement. The results indicate that differences between schools were not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis number two cannot be rejected. High parent involvement schools had a higher mean score on demand reconciliation than schools with low parent involvement.

> 3. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on tolerance for uncertainty of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

Table seven reports results of responses from tolerance of uncertainty in terms of high and low parent involvement. The results indicate that differences between schools were not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis number three cannot be rejected. High parent involvement schools had a higher mean score on tolerance for uncertainty than schools with low parent involvement.

> 4. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on persuasiveness of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

Table eight reports results of responses on persuasiveness in terms of high and low parent involvement. Data collected indicate no significant difference at the .05

TABLE FIVE

Hypothesis One: Representation

SCHOOLS	N	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Correlation Coefficient	D.F.	X^2	Significance
High Parent Involvement	49	19.94	2.58	.0454	11	17.00	N.S.
Low Parent Involvement	63	20.14	261				

TABLE SIX

Hypothesis Two: Demand Reconciliation

SCHOOLS	N	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Correlation Coefficient	D.F.	X^2	Significance
High Parent Involvement	49	20.31	3.04	-.1304	14	13.09	N.S.
Low Parent Involvement	63	19.35	4.04				

TABLE SEVEN

Hypothesis Three: Tolerance of Uncertainty

SCHOOLS	N	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Correlation Coefficient	D.F.	X^2	Significance
High Parent Involvement	49	38.24	14.49	-.1291	23	19.73	N.S.
Low Parent Involvement	63	36.87	25.81				

TABLE EIGHT

Hypothesis Four: Persuasiveness

SCHOOLS	N	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Correlation Coefficient	D.F.	X^2	Significance
High Parent Involvement	49	40.84	14.36	-.2110	24	18.89	N.S.
Low Parent Involvement	63	38.54	25.97				

level. Therefore, hypothesis number four cannot be rejected. High parent involvement schools had a higher mean score on persuasiveness than schools with low parent involvement.

> 5. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on initiation of structure of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

Table nine reports results of responses on initiation of structure in terms of high and low parent involvement. Data collected indicate no significant difference at the .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis number five cannot be rejected. High parent involvement schools had a higher mean score on initiation of structure than schools with low parent involvement.

> 6. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on tolerance of freedom of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

Table ten reports results of responses on tolerance of freedom in terms of high and low parent involvement. Data collected indicate no significant difference at the .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis number six cannot be rejected. High parent involvement schools had a higher mean score on tolerance of freedom than schools with low parent involvement.

> 7. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on role assumption of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

Table eleven reports results of responses on role assumption in terms of high and low parent involvement.

TABLE NINE

Hypothesis Five: Initiation of Structure

SCHOOLS	N	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Correlation Coefficient	D.F.	X^2	Significance
High Parent Involvement	49	41.24	14.17	-.0604	18	22.19	N.S.
Low Parent Involvement	63	40.62	25.85				

TABLE TEN

Hypothesis Six: Tolerance of Freedom

SCHOOLS	N	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Correlation Coefficient	D.F.	X^2	Significance
High Parent Involvement	49	40.67	14.31	-.1621	24	32.83	N.S.
Low Parent Involvement	63	38.87	26.24				

Results indicate no significant difference at the .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis number seven cannot be rejected. Low parent involvement schools had a higher mean score on role assumption than schools with high parent involvement.

8. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on consideration of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

Table twelve reports results of responses on consideration in terms of high and low parent involvement. Results indicate that there was no significant difference between schools at the .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis eight cannot be rejected. High parent involvement schools had a higher mean score on consideration than schools with low parent involvement.

9. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on production emphasis of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

Table thirteen reports results of responses on production emphasis in terms of high and low parent involvement. Results indicate differences between schools were not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis number nine cannot be rejected. High parent involvement schools had a higher mean score on production emphasis than schools with low parent involvement.

10. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on predictive accuracy of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

TABLE ELEVEN

Hypothesis Seven: Role Assumption

SCHOOLS	N	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Correlation Coefficient	D.F.	X^2	Significance
High Parent Involvement	49	28.57	14.39	.1002	4	4.76	N.S.
Low Parent Involvement	63	31.43	14.13				

TABLE TWELVE

Hypothesis Eight: Consideration

SCHOOLS	N	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Correlation Coefficient	D.F.	X^2	Significance
High Parent Involvement	49	42.18	16.06	-.2937	24	30.85	N.S.
Low Parent Involvement	63	38.57	25.75				

Table fourteen reports results of responses on predictive accuracy in terms of high and low parent involvement. Results indicate that differences between schools were not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis number ten cannot be rejected. High parent involvement schools had a higher mean score on predictive accuracy than those schools with low parent involvement.

11. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on integration of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

Table fifteen reports results of responses on integration in terms of high and low parent involvement. Results indicate differences between schools were not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis number eleven cannot be rejected. High parent involvement schools had a higher mean score on integration than schools with low parent involvement.

12. There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on superior orientation of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement.

Table sixteen reports results of responses on superior orientation in terms of high and low parent involvement. Results indicate differences between schools were not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, hypothesis number twelve cannot be rejected. High parent involvement schools had a higher mean score on superior orientation than schools with low parent involvement.

TABLE THIRTEEN

Hypothesis Nine: Production Emphasis

SCHOOLS	N	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Correlation Coefficient	D.F.	X^2	Significance
High Parent Involvement	49	35.69	14.00	-.0160	25	28.65	N.S.
Low Parent Involvement	63	35.51	26.89				

TABLE FOURTEEN

Hypothesis Ten: Predictive Accuracy

SCHOOLS	N	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Correlation Coefficient	D.F.	X^2	Significance
High Parent Involvement	49	39.76	15.29	-.1791	24	25.34	N.S.
Low Parent Involvement	63	37.56	26.58				

TABLE FIFTEEN

Hypothesis Eleven: Integration

SCHOOLS	N	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Correlation Coefficient	D.F.	X^2	Significance
High Parent Involvement	49	39.39	14.23	-.0747	23	15.68	N.S.
Low Parent Involvement	63	38.59	26.08				

TABLE SIXTEEN

Hypothesis Twelve: Superior Orientation

SCHOOLS	N	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Correlation Coefficient	D.F.	X^2	Significance
High Parent Involvement	49	19.74	3.77	.0561	11	18.74	N.S.
Low Parent Involvement	63	20.83	3.91				

In summary, the administrative behavior of principals and level of parent involvement were tested using twelve null hypotheses. These hypotheses took the form that there is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on representation of principals in schools with high and low parent involvement. Eleven similar null hypotheses dealing with demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration and superior orientation were tested. No significant differences were found. Therefore, none of the hypotheses could be rejected.

Associations Between LBDQ Scores and Demographic Characteristics of Principals

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between administrative behavior variables as measured by the LBDQ and the extent of parent involvement. However, since parent involvement may be associated with demographic characteristics of principals, the relationship between these characteristics and variables measured by the LBDQ also was investigated.

A computer program was used to study associations between principals' behavior as measured by the LBDQ and the following characteristics of principals: sex, age, education, ethnicity, years in system, years of experience in present school building. Cross tabulations and correlation were used in determining statistical significance and inference.

Table seventeen reports results from responses in three categories in relation to school and gender of principals. The results indicate no significant difference on the four variables in Category I.

In Category II there was a significant difference in the variable of role assumption. Female principals viewed their leadership as giving greater emphasis to role than male principals. There were no significant differences on the remaining variables in Category II.

In Category III, there was a significant difference on the variable of production emphasis. Males scored higher than females; in other words they were perceived by teachers as applying more pressure on staff to produce than did female principals.

Table eighteen reports responses as they relate to the age of the principals. In the sample studied no significant differences were found in terms of each variable in Categories I and II. In Category III significant differences were found in superior orientation and predictive accuracy. Older principals were on the average assigned higher scores on predictive accuracy and superior orientation than were younger principals.

Table nineteen reports on the relations between educational levels and categories. There were no significant differences at the .05 level in Categories I and II.

TABLE SEVENTEEN

Gender of Principals and Variables in LBDQ

Category	Variables	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	D.F.	X^2	Significance
I	Representation	20.07	2.59	11	10.89	N.S.
	Demand Reconciliation	19.77	3.66	14	9.16	N.S.
	Tolerance of Uncertainty	34.47	5.30	23	19.97	N.S.
	Persuasiveness	39.55	5.43	24	30.66	N.S.
II	Initiation of Structure	40.89	5.17	18	16.18	N.S.
	Tolerance of Freedom	39.66	5.53	24	15.48	N.S.
	Role Assumption	30.18	14.21	4	11.17	9.49*
	Consideration	40.15	6.13	24	36.16	N.S.
III	Production Emphasis	35.39	5.79	25	38.50	37.65*
	Predictive Accuracy	38.52	6.12	24	23.26	N.S.
	Integration	38.94	5.34	23	29.09	N.S.
	Superior Orientation	37.61	4.96	21	3.187	N.S.

* Chi-square table value.

TABLE EIGHTEEN

Age Levels of Principals and Variables in LBDQ

Category	Variables	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	D.F.	X^2	Significance
I	Representation	20.07	2.58	77	79.26	N.S.
	Demand Reconciliation	19.77	3.66	98	107.63	N.S.
	Tolerance of Uncertainty	34.47	5.30	161	144.53	N.S.
	Persuasiveness	39.54	5.43	168	149.80	N.S.
II	Initiation of Structure	40.89	5.17	128	141.07	N.S.
	Tolerance of Freedom	39.66	5.53	168	165.70	N.S.
	Role Assumption	30.18	14.20	28	37.18	N.S.
	Consideration	40.15	6.15	168	163.26	N.S.
III	Production Emphasis	35.59	5.79	175	175.90	N.S.
	Predictive Accuracy	38.52	6.12	168	206.84	114.43*
	Integration	38.92	5.34	161	154.89	N.S.
	Superior Orientation	37.61	4.96	40	97.23	45.36*

* Chi-square table value.

In Category III there were significant differences between educational levels of principals and the variables of integration and superior orientation. Principals with degrees above the master's were on the average assigned higher scores in both categories than were principals with fewer degrees.

Table twenty shows associations between race of principals and scores on variables. In Category I blacks on the average were assigned higher scores on tolerance of uncertainty than whites and the scores for whites were significantly higher on representation than for blacks.

In Category II differences associated with initiation of structure and consideration were significant, at the .05 level. Blacks on the average were assigned higher scores on consideration, while the scores for whites were higher on initiation of structure.

In Category III there were significant differences at the .05 level between races on production emphasis, predictive accuracy and integration at the .05 level. Blacks on the average were assigned higher scores on production emphasis and predictive accuracy; whites on the average were assigned higher scores on integration.

Table twenty-one reports the relationship between number of years principals had served in the school building and variables in Categories I, II and III. No significant differences were found for any of the variables.

TABLE NINETEEN

Educational Levels of Principals and Variables in LBDQ

Category	Variables	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	D.F.	X^2	Significance
I	Representation	20.07	2.59	33	23.22	N.S.
	Demand Reconciliation	19.77	3.66	42	50.28	N.S.
	Tolerance of Uncertainty	34.47	5.30	69	51.48	N.S.
	Persuasiveness	39.54	5.43	72	83.99	N.S.
II	Initiation of Structure	40.89	5.17	54	67.40	N.S.
	Tolerance of Freedom	39.66	5.53	69	46.09	N.S.
	Role Assumption	30.18	14.20	12	6.82	N.S.
	Consideration	40.15	6.13	72	70.08	N.S.
III	Production Emphasis	35.39	5.79	75	71.18	N.S.
	Predictive Accuracy	38.52	6.12	72	72.33	N.S.
	Integration	38.93	5.34	69	116.79	56.99*
	Superior Orientation	37.61	4.96	60	121.83	53.87*

* Chi-square table value.

TABLE TWENTY

Race of Principals and Variables in LBDQ

Category	Variables	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	D.F.	X^2	Significance
I	Representation	20.07	2.59	22	18.06	33.92*
	Demand Reconciliation	19.77	3.66	28	50.49	N.S.
	Tolerance of Uncertainty	37.47	5.30	46	60.54	49.23*
	Persuasiveness	39.54	5.43	46	64.81	N.S.
II	Initiation of Structure	40.89	5.17	36	54.87	44.81*
	Tolerance of Freedom	39.66	5.53	48	56.80	N.S.
	Role Assumption	30.18	14.20	8	8.38	N.S.
	Consideration	40.15	6.13	48	61.87	50.86*
III	Production Emphasis	35.59	5.78	50	95.00	41.54*
	Predictive Accuracy	38.52	6.12	46	71.17	49.23*
	Integration	38.93	5.34	44	66.85	46.94*
	Superior Orientation	37.61	4.69	29	38.63	N.S.

* Chi-square table value.

TABLE TWENTY-ONE

Principals' Years in School Building and Variables in LBDQ

Category	Variables	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	D.F.	X^2	Significance
I	Representation	20.07	2.59	77	62.14	N.S.
	Demand Reconciliation	19.77	3.66	98	73.69	N.S.
	Tolerance of Uncertainty	37.47	5.30	161	105.94	N.S.
	Persuasiveness	39.54	5.43	168	130.90	N.S.
II	Initiation of Structure	40.89	5.17	126	102.26	N.S.
	Tolerance of Freedom	39.66	5.53	168	131.79	N.S.
	Role Assumption	30.18	14.02	28	34.59	N.S.
	Consideration	40.15	6.13	168	159.79	N.S.
III	Production Emphasis	35.59	5.79	175	192.15	N.S.
	Predictive Accuracy	38.52	6.11	168	171.73	N.S.
	Integration	38.94	5.34	151	156.98	N.S.
	Superior Orientation	37.61	4.69	122	107.83	N.S.

Table twenty-two reports the relationship between the number of years the principal had served in the school system and scores on variables in categories I, II and III. No significant differences were found for variables in categories I and II. In category III there was a significant difference for production emphasis, integration and superior orientation. Principals who had served in the school system longer were on the average assigned higher scores on each of the three variables.

Table twenty-three summarizes significant differences at the .05 level on demographic characteristics of principals and scores on LBDQ variables. In category I blacks on the average were assigned higher scores on demand reconciliation and tolerance of uncertainty than whites and the scores for whites were significantly higher on representation than for blacks.

In category II blacks on the average were assigned higher scores on consideration while the scores for whites were higher on initiation of structure. Females on the average were assigned higher scores on role assumption than males.

In category III blacks on the average were assigned higher scores on production emphasis and predictive accuracy; whites on the average were assigned higher scores on integration. Males on the average were assigned higher scores on production emphasis. Older principals on the

TABLE TWENTY-TWO

Principals' Years in System and Variables in LBDQ

Category	Variables	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	D.F.	X^2	Significance
I	Representation	20.07	2.58	44	41.85	N.S.
	Demand Reconciliation	19.77	3.66	56	47.50	N.S.
	Tolerance of Uncertainty	37.47	5.30	92	66.71	N.S.
	Persuasiveness	39.54	5.42	96	96.06	N.S.
II	Initiation of Structure	40.89	5.16	72	84.03	N.S.
	Tolerance of Freedom	39.66	5.53	96	84.36	N.S.
	Role Assumption	30.18	14.20	16	13.05	N.S.
	Consideration	40.15	6.13	96	81.35	N.S.
III	Production Emphasis	35.59	5.78	100	137.12	68.11*
	Predictive Accuracy	38.51	6.12	92	103.67	N.S.
	Integration	38.94	5.34	88	115.42	59.94*
	Superior Orientation	37.61	4.96	89	234.17	60.62*

* Chi-square table value.

TABLE TWENTY-THREE

Summary of Relationships Between Demographic Characteristics and Scores on LBDQ

Categories	Race		Sex		Age		Educational Level		Years in School Building		Years in School System	
	B	W	F	M	Younger	Older	Less	More	Fewer	More	Fewer	More
CATEGORY I												
Representation		*										
Demand Reconciliation	*											
Tolerance of Uncertainty	*											
Persuasiveness												
CATEGORY II												
Initiation of Structure		*										
Tolerance of Freedom												
Role Assumption			*									
Consideration	*											
CATEGORY III												
Production Emphasis	*			*								*
Predictive Accuracy	*					*						
Integration		*						*				*
Superior Orientation						*		*				*

* Indicates a significantly higher score (.05 level)

average scored higher on predictive accuracy and superior orientation than did younger principals. Principals with more education on the average scored higher on integration and superior orientation than did principals with less education. Principals with more years in the system on the average scored higher on production emphasis, integration and superior orientation than did principals with less years in the system.

Associations Between Demographic Characteristics of Principals and Parent Involvement

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between the administrative behavior of principals as measured by the LBDQ and the level of parent involvement. However, as reported earlier no significant associations were found. Accordingly, an effort was made to see if there was any relationship between the demographic characteristics of principals and the level of parent involvement.

A chi-square test was run for significance of principal characteristics on sex, age, educational levels, race, years in system, and years in school building. Table twenty-four shows that educational levels of principals in high involvement schools and years in system were significant at the .05 level.

TABLE TWENTY-FOUR

High Parent Involvement Schools and Descriptive Variables

		Measurements	
Descriptive Variables	Degrees of Freedom	Chi-Square	Significance
Sex	88	165.81	N.S.
Age	69	129.99	N.S.
Educational Levels	168	94.52	114.43*
Race	87	111.84	N.S.
Years in System	100	67.27	68.11*
Years in School Building	83	95.34	N.S.

* Chi-square table value.

Table twenty-five shows that sex was significant in low involvement schools in that females were principals in 75% of the schools. Additionally, age and race were significant.

Summary

In summary, the administrative behavior of principals and level of parent involvement was tested using twelve null hypotheses. These hypotheses took the form that there is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on representation of principals in schools with high and low parent involvement. Eleven similar null hypotheses dealing with demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration and superior orientation were tested. No significant differences were found. Therefore, none of the hypotheses could be rejected.

A study of the association between the demographic characteristics of principals and scores assigned on the LBDQ instrument revealed that black principals on the average were assigned significantly higher scores on demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, consideration, production emphasis and predictive accuracy; white principals on the average were assigned higher scores on representation, initiation of structure, and integration.

TABLE TWENTY-FIVE

Low Parent Involvement Schools and Descriptive Variables

	Measurements		
Descriptive Variables	Degrees of Freedom	Chi-Square	Significance
Sex	50	55.79	51.54*
Age	87	60.42	58.28*
Educational Levels	100	61.17	N.S.
Race	30	42.45	43.77*
Years in System	36	39.09	N.S.
Years in Building	42	36.66	N.S.

* Chi-square table value.

Females on the average were assigned higher scores on role assumption while males on the average were assigned higher scores on production emphasis. Older principals on the average were assigned higher scores on predictive accuracy and superior orientation. Principals with more education on the average were assigned higher scores on integration and superior orientation. Principals with more years in the system on the average were assigned higher scores on production emphasis, integration and superior orientation.

Finally, a review of school community demographic data revealed that educational level of the community is associated with the level of parent involvement. Approximately 95% of parents in high parent involvement communities completed high school while only 75% of those in low parent involvement communities completed high school. Housing conditions were moderately standard in communities served by low parent involvement schools and above average in communities served by high parent involvement schools. In low parent involvement school communities there were several large corporations and industrial plants; in high parent involvement school communities there were virtually no industries.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISCUSSION

This is a report of a study of the association of parent involvement in schools and administrative styles of principals as measured by Halpin's Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ). Specifically, the following question was asked: Is there a relationship between administrative styles of principals as measured by the LBDQ and the level of parent involvement?

Sixteen elementary schools out of 105, in a large urban city in Southeastern United States were used in this study. The schools were chosen based on data from Volunteer Services Quarterly Report. This report, established by the Board of Education in September 1977, consists of eleven items grouped into five categories: 1) total number of volunteers involved, 2) total number of hours contributed, 3) total number of students served, 4) number of locally recruited volunteers, 5) number of centrally referred volunteers. The Board authorized this report in order to identify school program needs, communicate these needs effectively and encourage the utilization of parent services in the school community. The eight elementary schools showing the highest parent involvement on these reports for 1977, 1978 and 1979 and the eight showing the lowest parent involvement were included in the study.

Teachers in each school, selected by random numbers, were asked to complete the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). One hundred percent of the teachers who were sampled completed and returned the questionnaire.

The LBDQ contains descriptions of twelve dimensions of leader behavior organized in three categories:

Category I

Representation - speaks and acts as the representative of the group.

Demand Reconciliation - reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to the system.

Tolerance of Uncertainty - is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or becoming upset.

Persuasiveness - uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions.

Category II

Initiation of Structure - clearly defines own roles, and lets followers know what is expected.

Tolerance of Freedom - allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action.

Role Assumption - actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others.

Consideration - regards the comfort, well being, status and contributions of followers.

Category III

Production Emphasis - applies pressure for productive input.

Predictive Accuracy - exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcome accurately.

Integration - maintains a closely knit organization; resolves inter-member conflicts.

Superior Orientation - maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status.

The LBDQ instrument consists of one hundred items related to these twelve dimensions and concerning the leadership behavior of the leader of the respondent's organization. The members of a leader's group indicate the frequency with which he or she engages in each form of behavior by checking one of five adverbs: A-always, B-often, C-occasionally, D-seldom, E-never.

Data from the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire were analyzed using the Biomedical Computer Program Class 8D (cross-tabulation with variable stacking). Output data from this program included the following:

1. Frequency tables of all combination of the variables.
2. Chi-square values and degrees of freedom for each table.
3. Means, standard deviation, and correlation coefficient for each pair of variables.

The .05 level of significance was selected for inference evaluation on each investigated category. Findings from this procedure were presented according to LBDQ variables and categories.

Findings

Three types of findings related to parent involvement emerged from the study: 1) associations between administrative behavior of principals and level of parent involvement, 2) associations between school-community characteristics and level of parent involvement, 3) associations between demographic characteristics of principals and level of parent involvement.

Administrative Behavior of Principals and Level of Parent Involvement

Twelve null hypotheses were tested. The hypotheses took the form: There is no significant difference in LBDQ scores on representation of principals in schools with high parent involvement as compared with principals in schools with low parent involvement. Eleven similar null hypotheses dealing with demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, tolerance of freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration and superior orientation were tested. No significant differences (at the .05 level) were found. Therefore, none of the hypotheses could be rejected. Accordingly, the study failed to demonstrate a relationship between the leadership behavior of principals in the sixteen schools studied (as measured by the LBDQ) and the level of parent involvement.

One possible explanation is that parent participation was not an accepted practice in the school system studied until 1973 when the present superintendent was appointed. It is difficult to change attitudes of staff (principals) positively in the direction of parent participation/volunteerism once they have been negative. Principals during the previous administration were not required to have volunteer parents in the schools. Consequently, many principals did not have viable relationships between the school and the home. When the present school board mandated parent volunteers in every school principals were required to submit quarterly reports on parent volunteers. Many principals who were able to secure some parent volunteers were not enthusiastic supporters of parent involvement.

Characteristics of School Communities and the Level of Parent Involvement

The system studied has a black enrollment of 85%. However, there are sections in the city where blacks are in a minority. Blacks are bused into the schools on a majority to minority busing program which began in 1973.

In high parent involvement communities more than 95% of the parents completed high school and worked in professional positions. Housing was above average and there were no major industries located in these communities. Housing was composed of single family dwellings and generally in excellent condition. In low parent involvement communities, the majority of students were black and approximately 25%

of the parents were high school dropouts and recipients of federal assistance programs. Housing was composed of multi-family dwellings with over 60% in need of repair or replacement. Several large corporations were located in those communities. In the schools studied the socioeconomic status of the community is associated with the level of parent involvement.

Demographic Characteristics of Principals and Scores on LBDQ

Since some of the demographic characteristics of principals are associated with the level of parent involvement, tests were made to ascertain if the demographic characteristics of principals were associated with their leadership behavior as measured by the LBDQ.

Category I measured administrative characteristics in terms of representative actions (representation), management demands (demand reconciliation), unknown events (tolerance of uncertainty) and personal persuasion (persuasiveness). There were no significant differences at the .05 level in this category relating to age and educational levels. In analyzing race there was a significant difference on tolerance of uncertainty and representation variables. Blacks on the average were assigned higher scores on tolerance of uncertainty than were whites; scores for whites were higher on representation than for blacks. Years in school building and the level of parent involvement did not reveal a statistical difference in this category of LBDQ variables.

Category II measured role expectation (initiation of structure), staff creativity (tolerance of freedom), leadership role (role assumption), and personal concerns (consideration). There were no significant differences at the .05 level relating to age and educational levels. Initiation of structure and consideration were affected significantly by race. Whites on the average were assigned higher scores on initiation of structure than blacks and scores for blacks were higher on consideration than were those for whites. Years in school building and parent involvement were not significant at the .05 level.

Category III revealed leadership outputs (production emphasis), leadership accuracy (predictive accuracy), orientation (integration) and organizational perceptions (superior orientation). Age level was significant in reference to predictive accuracy and superior orientation. Educational levels were significant in terms of superior orientation. Years in school system was significant at the .05 level in terms of production emphasis, integration and superior orientation.

These findings on associations between demographic characteristics of principals and scores on the LBDQ can only be used to suggest that some relationships may exist. The sample was too small to draw conclusions and the study was done in a single southeastern school district. However, this study does suggest that further research along this line be conducted using a larger sample population and in various locations.

Demographic Characteristics of Principals and Level of Parent Involvement

In high parent involvement schools educational levels and years in system were significant at the .05 level. Approximately 62.5% of the principals in high parent involvement schools earned the specialist or doctorate degree. An average of years in the system for principals in high parent involvement schools was 15.7 years.

In low parent involvement schools the sex and age of principals were significant at the .05 level. Approximately 75% of the principals in low parent involvement schools were females. The average age was 42.6 years.

Demographic data revealed significant differences associated with characteristics of principals and level of parent involvement. First, 75% of the principals in low parent involvement schools were females while in high parent involvement schools 75% were males; second, principals in low parent involvement schools had fewer years in the system than did principals in high parent involvement schools; and third, principalships in low parent involvement schools were evenly divided between black and white while in high parent involvement schools 75% of the principals were black. Principals in low parent involvement schools were an average of 4.1 years younger than were principals in high parent involvement schools.

However, it may not be correct to assume that there is a direct association between the demographic characteristics of principals and the level of parent involvement. The demographic data on communities presented in Chapter I show that the level of parent involvement is positively associated with the socio-economic status of the community as measured by such indicators as estimated family income, condition of housing, and level of education reached by the adults. In the school system studied principals are permitted to apply for administrative positions as vacancies occur. The selection process is determined on the basis of seniority in the school system and seniority in the position. Since principals generally prefer to move to schools in higher socio-economic communities, older principals with more years of experience in the system tend to be in schools with higher socio-economic status. These tend to be the schools with more parent involvement.

The system studied maintains a seventy-thirty black/white ratio of administrators. However, the schools selected for the study contain a sixty-forty ratio. Black males were principals in 75% of high parent involvement schools. Does this suggest that black males promote higher parent involvement than do females? Possibly, but it should be noted that black males were assigned as principals in 75% of the schools in higher socio-economic communities. Is it possible that a caste system operates which enables males to become principals in elementary schools in higher socio-economic communities?

Conclusion

The following conclusions are an outgrowth of data analysis and interpretation regarding the community and administrative and demographic characteristics of principals as they relate to high and low parent involvement in schools.

1. There were no significant differences at the .05 level between the leadership behavior of principals as measured by the LBDQ, in high and low parent involvement schools.
2. Six of eight principals in high parent involvement schools were males; in low parent involvement schools six of eight principals were females.
3. Six of eight principals in high parent involvement schools held degrees beyond the masters level; in low parent involvement schools one of eight principals had earned a degree beyond the masters.
4. Students from high parent involvement schools appeared to live in better family dwellings than did those from low parent involvement schools.
5. Size of the school and ethnicity of the students did not appear to be a factor in parent involvement.
6. Years in the school system was significant in high parent involvement schools and not in low parent involvement schools.
7. Age of the principal was significant in low parent involvement schools and not in high involvement schools. The average age for principals in high parent involvement schools was 46.3 years; in low involvement schools the average age was 42.2 years.

8. Seventy-five percent of principals in high parent involvement schools were black; 75% of principals in low parent involvement schools were white.
9. Black males tended to be principals in high parent involvement schools (75%); in low parent involvement schools 75% of the principals were females.

In summary, the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) did not reveal significant differences in administrative characteristics of principals in schools with high parent involvement and of principals in schools with low parent involvement. However, the data do suggest that the demographic characteristics of principals and the socio-economic status of the school community may be associated either directly or indirectly with the level of parent involvement.

Implications

The findings from this study give credence to the following implications. First, administrative characteristics of principals as measured by the twelve variables of the LBDQ do not relate to parent involvement. While these variables may be useful in predicting some types of behaviors, these behaviors apparently are not associated with establishing active parent involvement programs. This does not rule out the possibility that other variables in principals' behavior may be associated with level of parent involvement.

One confounding factor in this study was that several schools with high parent involvement participate in federal programs; these programs generally require parent advisory councils in the schools and active parent involvement. Since the parent participation required in schools with federal programs is included in the regular parent volunteer report, this report may not reflect the extent to which parent involvement is a direct result of principal and parent initiative.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study showed no significant difference between leadership behavior of principals, as measured by LBDQ, and parent involvement. However, some associations may exist between the behavior of principals and the level of parent involvement. Discovery of these associations could improve principal effectiveness in encouraging parent involvement. The following types of studies could lead to finding principal behaviors associated with high parent involvement.

1. A study needs to be conducted in which parents assess principals' behavior using the LBDQ. Such a study may reveal that the LBDQ is inappropriate and a new instrument should be devised.
2. A case study approach should be used to examine the leadership behaviors of principals in high and low parent involvement schools.
3. A case study approach should be used to study possible relationships between the demographic characteristics of principals and the level of parent involvement in schools.

4. The importance of matching teaching styles with learning styles has been indicated. The possibility of designing a method for "matching" an administrator's characteristics with a given school community needs to be explored.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

Dear Teacher:

I am engaged in a study to determine teacher attitudes towards the leadership styles of principals as it relates to parent involvement. I am interested in finding out how you feel about your principal's administrative style. Therefore, I am requesting that you take a few minutes and complete the attached questionnaire. Please complete and return to me within three (3) days. I have provided a self-addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience.

Let me assure you that your identity will never be revealed in relationship to this study at any time.

This study has been approved by the Atlanta Public Schools Research and Evaluation Division.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Joyce C. Kirkpatrick

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

Demographic Data Sheet

Directions: Please place a check beside the appropriate response that applies to you.

I. SEX

_____ Male

_____ Female

II. AGE

_____ 20-25

_____ 26-30

_____ 31-35

_____ 36-40

_____ 41-45

_____ 46-50

_____ 51-55

_____ 56-60

III. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

_____ College

_____ Master's Degree

_____ Specialist Degree

_____ Doctorate

_____ Post Graduate Study

IV. ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION

_____ White

_____ Black

_____ Other

V. YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN THIS SYSTEM

_____ 1-5

_____ 6-10

_____ 11-15

_____ 16-20

_____ 21-25

_____ 26-30

_____ 31-35

_____ 36-40

VI. YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN THIS SCHOOL

_____ 1-5

_____ 6-10

_____ 11-15

_____ 16-20

APPENDIX C

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example: He often acts as described .... A B C D E

Example: He never acts as described .... A B C D E

Example: He occasionally acts as described ..... A B C D E

----

1. He acts as the spokesman of the group .... A B C D E
2. He waits patiently for the results of a decision .... A B C D E
3. He makes pep talks to stimulate the group ... A B C D E

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never

4. He lets group members know what is expected of them .... A B C D E
5. He allows the members complete freedom in their work .... A B C D E
6. He is hesitant about taking initiative in the group .... A B C D E
7. He is friendly and approachable .... A B C D E
8. He encourages overtime work .... A B C D E
9. He makes accurate decisions .... A B C D E
10. He gets along well with the people above him .... A B C D E
11. He publicizes the activities of the group .. A B C D E
12. He becomes anxious when he cannot find out what is coming next .... A B C D E
13. His arguments are convincing .... A B C D E
14. He encourages the use of uniform procedures .... A B C D E
15. He permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems .... A B C D E
16. He fails to take necessary action .... A B C D E
17. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group .... A B C D E
18. He stresses being ahead of competing groups .... A B C D E
19. He keeps the group working together as a team .... A B C D E

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never

20. He keeps the group in good standing with higher authority .... A B C D E

21. He speaks as the representative of the group .... A B C D E

22. He accepts defeat in stride .... A B C D E

23. He argues persuasively for his point of view .... A B C D E

24. He tries out his ideas in the group .... A B C D E

25. He encourages initiative in the group members .... A B C D E

26. He lets other persons take away his leadership in the group .... A B C D E

27. He puts suggestions made by the group into operation .... A B C D E

28. He needles members for greater effort ...... A B C D E

29. He seems able to predict what is coming next .... A B C D E

30. He is working hard for a promotion .... A B C D E

31. He speaks for the group when visitors are present .... A B C D E

32. He accepts delays without becoming upset ... A B C D E

33. He is a very persuasive talker .... A B C D E

34. He makes his attitudes clear to the group .. A B C D E

35. He lets the members do their work the way they think best .... A B C D E

36. He lets some members take advantage of him . A B C D E

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never

37. He treats all group members as his equals .. A B C D E
38. He keeps the work moving at a rapid pace ... A B C D E
39. He settles conflicts when they occur in the group .... A B C D E
40. His superiors act favorably on most of his suggestions .... A B C D E
41. He represents the group at outside meetings .... A B C D E
42. He becomes anxious when waiting for new development .... A B C D E
43. He is very skillful in an argument .... A B C D E
44. He decides what shall be done and how it shall be done .... A B C D E
45. He assigns a task, then lets the members handle it .... A B C D E
46. He is the leader of the group in name only . A B C D E
47. He gives advance notice of changes .... A B C D E
48. He pushes for increased production .... A B C D E
49. Things usually turn out as he predicts ..... A B C D E
50. He enjoys the privileges of his position ... A B C D E
51. He handles complex problems efficiently .... A B C D E
52. He is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty .... A B C D E
53. He is not a very convincing talker .... A B C D E
54. He assigns group members to particular tasks .... A B C D E

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never

55. He turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go to it .... A B C D E

56. He backs down when he ought to stand firm .. A B C D E

57. He keeps to himself .... A B C D E

58. He asks the members to work harder .... A B C D E

59. He is accurate in predicting the trend of events .... A B C D E

60. He gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members .... A B C D E

61. He gets swamped by details .... A B C D E

62. He can wait just so long, then blows up .... A B C D E

63. He speaks from a strong inner conviction ... A B C D E

64. He makes sure that his part in the group is understood by the group members .... A B C D E

65. He is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action .... A B C D E

66. He lets some members have authority that he should keep .... A B C D E

67. He looks out for the personal welfare of group members .... A B C D E

68. He permits the members to take it easy in their work .... A B C D E

69. He sees to it that the work of the group is coordinated .... A B C D E

70. His word carries weight with his superiors . A B C D E

71. He gets things all tangled up .... A B C D E

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never

72. He remains calm when uncertain about coming events .... A B C D E

73. He is an inspiring talker .... A B C D E

74. He schedules the work to be done .... A B C D E

75. He allows the group a high degree of initiative .... A B C D E

76. He takes full charge when emergencies arise .... A B C D E

77. He is willing to make changes .... A B C D E

78. He drives hard when there is a job to be done .... A B C D E

79. He helps group members settle their differences .... A B C D E

80. He gets what he asks for from his superiors .... A B C D E

81. He can reduce a madhouse to system and order .... A B C D E

82. He is able to delay action until the proper time occurs .... A B C D E

83. He persuades others that his ideas are to their advantage .... A B C D E

84. He maintains definite standards of performance .... A B C D E

85. He trusts the members to exercise good judgment .... A B C D E

86. He overcomes attempts made to challenge his leadership .... A B C D E

87. He refuses to explain his actions .... A B C D E

A = Always

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Never

88. He urges the group to beat its previous record .... A B C D E

89. He anticipates problems and plans for them . A B C D E

90. He is working his way to the top .... A B C D E

91. He gets confused when too many demands are made of him .... A B C D E

92. He worries about the outcome of any new procedure .... A B C D E

93. He can inspire enthusiasm for a project .... A B C D E

94. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations .... A B C D E

95. He permits the group to set its own pace ... A B C D E

96. He is easily recognized as the leader of the group .... A B C D E

97. He acts without consulting the group .... A B C D E

98. He keeps the group working up to capacity .. A B C D E

99. He maintains a closely knit group .... A B C D E

100. He maintains cordial relations with superiors .... A B C D E

APPENDIX D

SCORING KEY

The subject indicates his response by drawing a circle around one of the five letters (A, B, C, D, E) following an item. As indicated on the Scoring Key, most items are scored:

A	B	C	D	E
5	4	3	2	1

A circle around A gives the item a score of 5; a circle around B gives it a score of 4; and a circle around E gives the item a score of 1.

The 20 starred items on the Scoring Key are scored in the reverse direction, as follows:

A	B	C	D	E
1	2	3	4	5

SCORING KEY
LBDQ FORM XII

* Starred items are scored 1 2 3 4 5

All other items are scored 5 4 3 2 1

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
* 6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
* 12.
13.
14.
15.
* 16.
17.
18.
19.
20.
21.
22.
23.
24.
25.
* 26.
27.
28.
29.
30.
31.
32.
33.
34.
35.
* 36.
37.
38.
39.
40.
41.
* 42.
43.
44.
45.
* 46.
47.
48.
49.
50.
51.
52.
* 53.
54.
55.
* 56.
* 57.
58.
59.
60.
* 61.
* 62.
63.
64.
* 65.
* 66.
67.
* 68.
69.
70.
* 71.
72.
73.
74.
75.
76.
77.
78.
79.
80.
81.
82.
83.
84.
85.
86.
* 87.
88.
89.
90.
* 91.
* 92.
93.
94.
95.
96.
* 97.
98.
99.
100.

APPENDIX E

VOLUNTEER SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT

VOLUNTEER SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT

☐ Fall
☐ Winter
☐ Spring
☐ Summer

School or Department ______________________________

Principal or Administrator __________________________

School Volunteer Staff Contact Person _________________

School Volunteer Community Resource Person _____________

Indicate all parents and others who have provided services:

Regularly Scheduled Volunteers (minimum two hours per week)

Number of Volunteers Involved _____
Number of Hours Contributed _____

Special Project Volunteers (short terms or irregular service)

Number of Volunteers Involved _____
Number of Hours Contributed _____

Resource Volunteers (speakers, exhibits, presentations, etc.)

Number of Volunteers Involved _____
Number of Hours Contributed _____

Summary

1. Total Number of All Volunteers Involved ____________
2. Total Number of Hours Contributed _________________
3. Total Number of Students Served __________________
4. Number of Locally Recruited Volunteers _____________
5. Number of Centrally Referred Volunteers ____________

Comments

____

____

____________________ ______________________________

Date Principal's Signature

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Barth, Roland S. Open Education and the American School. New York: Agathon Press, Inc., 1972.

Bartky, John L. Administration as Educational Leadership. California: Stanford University Press, 1956.

Bobbitt, Franklin. How to Make a Curriculum. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press Company, 1924.

Campbell, Joel T. Educational Testing Service. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Carnoy, Martin. Education as Cultural Imperialism. New York: David McKay, Inc., 1974.

Cartwright, Darwin, and Alvin Zander. Group Dynamics Research and Theory. New York: Row Peterson, 1953.

Danet, Brenda, and Elihu Katz, eds. Bureaucracy and the Public. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1971.

Dethy, Ray C., and Rayland H. Ostrander. A Values Approach to Educational Administration. New York: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co., 1973.

Fantine, Mario, Marilyn Gittell, and Richard Magot. Community Control and Urban Schools. New York: Praeger Publishing, Inc., 1970.

Foster, Marcus A. Making Schools Work. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971.

Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

Haskin, Jim, and Anita Allen, eds. Black Manifesto for Education. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1973.

Hunter, Floyd. *Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1953.

Illich, Ivan. *Deschooling Society*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970.

Johns, Roe L., Edgar Morphet and Theodore Reller. *Educational Administration: Concepts, Practices and Issues*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.

Kimbrough, Ralph B. *Political Power and Educational Decision-Making*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

Litwak, Eugene, and Henry J. Meyer. *School, Family and Neighborhood: The Theory and Practices of School Community Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.

Marchs, Sheldon, and Harry N. Rivlin, eds. *Conflicts in Urban Education*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1970.

Meranto, Philip J. *School Politics in the Metropolis*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1970.

Olsen, Edward G. *School and Community*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.

Passow, A. Harry, ed. *Urban Education in the 1970's*. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1971.

Pressey, Sidney L. *Psychology in Education*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Schiller, Herbert I. *The Mind Managers*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1973.

Selakovich, Daniel. *The Schools and American Society*. Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdelle Publishing Company, 1967.

Weinberg, Carl. *Education and Social Problems*. New York: The Free Press, Collier-Macmillan, Limited, 1971.

Dissertation

Holmes, Emory. "Community Representation in Educational Decision Making: An Exploratory Case Study of School-Community Advisory Councils." Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 33, No. 4A, June, 1973, p. 1360.

Articles

Black, John D. "The Leadership Ability Evaluation." Personality Tests and Reviews. New Jersey: The Cryphon Press, 1970, p. 1083.

Chevers, Martin M., and Fred E. Fiedler. "Your Style of Leadership." Scientific Digest, 82 (August, 1977), p. 46.

Clark, Kenneth B. "Social Policy, Power and Social Research." Harvard Education Review, 43 (February, 1973), pp. 120-121.

Estes, Nolan. "Operation - Citizen Involvement Spells Help for School Challenges." Educational Leadership, 31 (January, 1974), p. 365.

Estes, Sidney H. "Instruction Inner-City: Where It's Really At!" Educational Leadership, 32 (March, 1975), p. 387.

Gibb, Cecil. "Leadership." Handbook of Social Psychology. New York: Addison and Wesley, 1954, p. 887.

Moore, Donald. "Community Education." NCESA News (May, 1974), p. 10.

Williams, Charles T. "Involving the Community in Implementing Pluralism." Educational Leadership, 32 (December, 1974), p. 170.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Joyce Collins Kirkpatrick, daughter of Emmett and Henrietta Collins, was born in New Orleans, Louisiana, September 26, 1941. She graduated from McDonough #35 High School in 1959. She received the degree of Bachelor of Arts with a major in elementary education in June of 1963.

In September, 1963, she began her teaching career in the Orleans Parish public school system. After one successful year of classroom teaching, she was promoted to 7th grade chairperson serving as coordinator of curriculum. She maintained that position until June, 1965, when she moved to Jacksonville, Florida.

In Florida she taught successfully for three years and was promoted to department chairman, 8th grade social studies. During that time she began graduate work and received a Master of Arts degree in elementary education from Florida A & M University in August, 1970.

In August of 1970 she moved to Atlanta, Georgia, and began teaching in the public school. After two years of successful teaching, she conducted a workshop for the teachers in Tusculoosa, Alabama, on individualized instruction. During her third year of teaching in Atlanta, she became department chairperson for 8th grade social studies.

She moved to Gainesville, Florida, in September of 1973 to begin her doctoral studies in curriculum and administration at the University of Florida. She maintained a graduate assistantship in the College of Education.

She is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Kappa Delta Pi, National PTA and the Georgia Association of Education.

Joyce is a widow and has one child, Danita Arlene Kirkpatrick.

Currently, she is the Atlanta Public Schools Executive High School Internships Liaison, Atlanta, Georgia.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Arthur J. Lewis

Arthur J. Lewis, Chairman
Professor of Instructional
Leadership and Support

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Elroy J. Bolduc

Elroy J. Bolduc
Professor of Subject Specialization Teacher Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Phillip A. Clark

Phillip A. Clark
Associate Professor of Educational Administration and
Supervision

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction in the College of Education and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

March, 1980

Dean, Graduate School